

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1369764



Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Burbridge
Adare

Weston-Square.



A

A THOUSAND YEARS OF ENGLISH
CHURCH HISTORY

GEORGE BELL & SONS

LONDON: YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN
NEW YORK: 66, FIFTH AVENUE, AND
BOMBAY: 53, ESPLANADE ROAD
CAMBRIDGE: DEIGHTON, BELL & CO.

A
THOUSAND YEARS
OF
ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY
FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE
DEATH OF QUEEN ELIZABETH

BR
746
AD

BY
L. O. ASPLEN, M.A.

LATE FOUNDATION SCHOLAR OF EMMANUEL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
ASSISTANT PRIEST AT THE PARISH CHURCH
WESTON-SUPER-MARE

"With one soul striving together for the faith of the gospel."
Phil. i. 27.

LONDON
GEORGE BELL AND SONS
1898

CHISWICK PRESS :—CHARLES WHITTINGHAM AND CO.
TOOKS COURT, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

TO THE
SOBER, PEACEABLE, AND TRULY CONSCIENTIOUS
SONS AND DAUGHTERS
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ;
AND TO ALL WHO,
IN EVERY PLACE,
CALL UPON THE NAME OF OUR
LORD JESUS CHRIST
(THEIR LORD AND OURS)
IN SINCERITY AND TRUTH.

333309

PREFACE

THE writer has had to compress so much into a small space that he fears the result, especially in the first three chapters, may be found dry reading.¹ If he has made little use of the many beautiful stories which blossom on the banks of the river of English Church History, it is because his object has been to bring out, at this most "needful time" of conflict, the facts upon which the position of the National Church is based, and with which all thoughtful Churchmen wish therefore to be acquainted. He looks upon the existing divisions among English Christians as profoundly calamitous and disastrous ; and the modern idea of "Undenominationalism"—the principle of infinite religious division cheerfully acquiesced in—seems to him as mischievous as it is certainly unscriptural. It does but "heal the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace ; when there is no peace."

Without one uncharitable thought of blame against those earnest and devoted workers for Christ who are to be found, thank GOD, in every "denomination," it is surely time to bring home to them, if possible, and to ourselves the truth that a fundamental law of Christ's Kingdom, and the "first condition of its missionary success," is an outward and visible unity among His followers such as the world can take cognizance of (S. John, xvii. 21). Unity is not necessarily *uniformity*

¹ Cursory readers will perhaps do well to omit altogether these three chapters, and to begin at the fourth.

—the methods of warfare may be different : but the officers supervising all must be the same.

The problem of fitting orthodox Dissenting bodies within the framework of the Church is not an insoluble one. It confronted Wesley just over a century ago, and was at least partially solved by his master-mind, though, unhappily for themselves and us, the Wesleyan societies after his death elected to forsake his counsels, and left the Church of England, of which he had been all his life so devoted a son.

May the Holy and Blessed Spirit of GOD brood upon the troubled waters, and bring order out of the chaos of sectarianism, light out of the darkness of religious controversy. May the prayer which the Church of England unceasingly offers for Dissenters as well as for her own people—"Grant that ALL they that do confess thy holy Name may agree in the truth of Thy holy Word, and live in unity and godly love"—be speedily and abundantly answered. May the position of the Church and the sects be thoughtfully pondered and studied, Bible in hand, by every Christian man. May we learn to forgive one another for all the mistakes and misunderstandings of the past, and find some way, without deserting the ancient verities of the Faith or the ancient bases of Church unity, to enrich our common Mother, the Church of the CHRISTIAN NATION of England, again with the many-coloured zeal and devotion of all her English sons and daughters. "Behold, how good and joyful a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." "O pray for the peace of Jerusalem : they shall prosper that love thee !"

WESTON-SUPER-MARE,
Festival of the Purification,
1898.

"We have here in the midst of us a national religious organization, older than the national civil government: for before the Saxon kingdoms were united under the Kings of Wessex, a thousand years ago, the Church—very much what it is now, in all essentials, except its relations with Rome—was already organized and at work in every English parish. . . . The Pope claimed, indeed, supremacy here as elsewhere, and was often very near making his claim good. But he never did make it good. Papal supremacy was always illegal in England, and denied and resisted by Norman and Plantagenet Kings and their Parliaments as firmly as by the Tudor princes, under whom the final separation was effected: and no one of the great Englishmen who bore a part in the final work ever dreamt of establishing a new Church or a new Faith, but only of reforming and purifying the Church and the Faith which had come down to them."—T. HUGHES, Q.C., *The Old Church*, p. 145.

"I am not one of those who think, as used to be currently assumed, that the legislation of Henry VIII. transferred the privileges and endowments of a national establishment from the Church of Rome to the Church of England. I believe that view rests upon imperfect historical information. I am quite prepared to admit, what I believe the best authorities of history now assert, that there has been amidst all these changes and developments a substantial identity and continuity of existence in our National Church from earliest history down to the present time."—RT. HON. H. H. ASQUITH, House of Commons, March 21st, 1895.

"The theory of the modern Dissenter is that our Church's existence begins at some (hitherto undetermined)

date, when Government disestablished and disendowed a Roman Church, and set up a Reformed Church in its stead. The Church is thus artfully represented as a Protestant sect, differing from the other sects only in the enjoyment of peculiar patronage from the secular power. This fabrication has been as successfully crushed by the forceps of historical fact as such shadowy myths can be."—REV. A. C. JENNINGS, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, p. 284.

"All things written in this booke I humbly and meekly submit to the censure of the grave and reverend Prelates within this land, to the judgement of learned men, and the sober consideration of all others. Wherein I may happely erre as others before me have done, but an heretike by the help of Almighty God I will never be."—HOOKER, MS. note on title-leaf of the *Christian Letter*.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	Introductory. The Ancient British Church	I
II.	The Conversion of the English	24
III.	Organization of the English Church	36
IV.	The Church of England in the Eighth Century	50
V.	The Ninth and Tenth Centuries, and part of the Eleventh. England and the Danes.	62
VI.	From the Middle of the Eleventh Century to the Middle of the Twelfth Century. England under the Normans	77
VII.	From the Middle of the Twelfth Century to the First Part of the Thirteenth Century. Henry II. and his Sons. The Struggle with Rome	99
VIII.	The Thirteenth Century (continued). England in Subjection to Rome. Growth of the English Constitution	118
IX.	The Fourteenth Century. Growing Tension with Rome. Wycliffe and the Lollards	136
X.	The Fifteenth Century. Preparation for the Reformation	157
XI.	The Sixteenth Century. Reign of Henry VIII. Eve of the Reformation in England	174
XII.	Reign of Henry VIII. (continued). Repudiation of Roman Jurisdiction in England	188
XIII.	Reign of Henry VIII. (concluded). Destruction of the Monasteries. Progress of the Reformation abroad and at home	210
XIV.	Reign of Edward VI. Progress of the Reformation	237
XV.	Reign of Queen Mary. The Reformation checked	257
XVI.	Reign of Queen Elizabeth. The Reformation Settlement	267
XVII.	Reign of Queen Elizabeth (concluded). Restoration of Effective Discipline. Rise of Dissent	290
APPENDIX A.	The Three Orders of the Christian Ministry	311
„ B.	The Archbishops of Canterbury	313

CONTENTS

	PAGE
APPENDIX C. The Parochial System	316
" D. Tithes	318
" E. Outbreak of Controversy on the Holy Eucharist	323
" F. Roman Corruptions of the Faith	324
" G. The "Real Presence" not Transubstantiation	325
" H. Indulgences	331
" J. Cranmer's Oath	333
" K. The Reigns of Edward VI. and Mary	334
" L. Prayer for the Faithful Departed	335
" M. The Christian "Sacrifice"	338
" N. The Athanasian Creed	345
" O. Confession in the Church of England	349
" P. The Kalendar of the Church of England	353
" Q. Fasting	361
" R. Religious Disunion	364
INDEX	367

[*Corrigenda*.—P. 98, ll. 18-20. *For* “was accepted . . . § 102” *substitute* “exercised considerable indirect influence, although never accepted as authoritative in England.” Add footnote 3: “The English canon law (see § 102) was codified in the reign of Henry V. by William Lyndwood, Dean of the Arches, in his *Provinciale*. See Bishop Stubbs, ‘Lectures,’ pp. 307-309.”]

P. 305, ll. 13, 14. *For* “till the present century” *substitute* “except at certain moments under the Stuart dynasty.”]

*O holy Church of England, bygone years
Beheld thee moulding our world-conquering race
For its high destiny. And as we trace
From age to age thy glories, who that hears
Can fail his tribute of indignant tears ?
Lo ! thine own sons would thrust thee from thy place,
Scorning the ancient channels of GOD'S grace
For man-made systems. Full of noble fears
Stand thy defenders. In one phalanx vast
May they move on unfaltering for thee,
In meekness spreading truth,¹ till errors flee
And all men know thy present and thy past
GOD-guided, that again our children see
A Christian England, ONE in Christ, at last !*

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 25.

[Written during the crisis of the contest in Parliament for the Church, June, 1895.]

A THOUSAND YEARS OF ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY. THE ANCIENT BRITISH CHURCH

“And He said unto them, Go into the whole world and proclaim the good tidings to all the creation. . . . And they went forth and proclaimed everywhere, the Lord working with them. . . .”—*S. Mark*, xvi. 15, 20.

“To Walys fled the cristianité
Of olde Bretons dwelling in this ile.”

CHAUCER, *The Man of Lawes Tale*.

§ 1. *The Church of England*.—The Church of England is now one thousand three hundred years old. For nearly a thousand years of her long history she was the *only* representative of Christianity in the land. Every Englishman in olden days was a Christian and baptized into her fold. It was not till about three hundred years or so ago, in the reign of Elizabeth, that certain Protestant sects on the one hand, and that of the “Roman Catholics” on the other, began to break away from the National Church and to set up their own independent meeting houses.¹ Doing “evil that good might come,” instead of remaining *in* the Church and loyally contending against anything that seemed to them erroneous, till it might be corrected by lawful authority, they deliberately broke that out-

¹ See §§ 328, 330. [§ denotes “section”; and §§ “sections.”]

ward and visible unity which is so precious to our Lord (S. John, xvii. 21), and have made party names of Luther, and Calvin, and Wesley, and others, exactly as the Corinthians of old began to do in the case of Paul, and Apollos, and Kephas (1 Cor. i. 10-13, iii. 1-17, 21, 22), for which they were so sternly and emphatically rebuked by S. Paul.¹

Let us then try to realize something of the long and glorious past of our great Church, which has grown with the growth of the English nation, till now her branches are spread over the whole world. And let us pray that God, who hates all discord and disunion, will give us back again, in His own good time, what we once had—the *one* Church of England for all English folk, with *one* mind and *one* mouth glorifying God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. xv. 6).

§ 2. Christianity in Britain.—For four hundred and fifty years after the birth of our Saviour there were no English in this land, and therefore, of course, there could be no Church of England. But there was a Christian Church here even in those old days. The Britons, who then inhabited the whole country, and whose descendants still live by our side in Wales, were Christians; and the history of their Church (since A.D. 1115 completely united with the Church of England) goes stretching back probably to the times of the Apostles themselves (see below, §§ 8, 9). One object of this introductory chapter is to gather up what is known of the history of this ancient British Church, which has for so many centuries been built into, and become an integral part of, the fair fabric of our English Christianity.

§ 3. The Early Christian Church.—The Message

¹ See the Homily “Against Contention,” *ad init.* Compare John Wesley’s earnest and reiterated warnings to his own followers, *not to separate from the Church of England*, warnings which they unhappily disregarded after his death (A.D. 1791).

of the Cross came upon the world with the freshness of a glad surprise. In the thirtieth year of the first century of our era¹ the Saviour of mankind yielded up His life upon the bitter Rood:² and, long before that first century closed, the whole of the then known world, from east to farthest west,³ was ringing with the glad tidings of salvation, and was already beginning to be penetrated with the new spirit of humility, joy, and self-sacrifice which is the special gift of Christianity to the world. God's only Son had become man to bear the punishment of His brethren's guilt,⁴ and to draw all men unto Him by the cords of love.⁵ On all who would accept Him He stood ready to bestow a new and higher life, His own Divine Nature,⁶ first washing them from the stains of sin in the Laver of Regeneration,⁷ and then feeding them with unearthly Food and Drink, the Body and Blood of the Sacrifice He had once for all offered on their behalf.⁸ And the partakers of this Divine life were not isolated units; they were incorporated into one vast Brotherhood,⁹

¹ The Christian era, from which we reckon our years, was calculated by the monk Dionysius Exiguus in the sixth century (A.D. 532), and he it was that placed our Lord's birth in A.U.C. 754, *four years too late*. From the chronology of Herod's reign, and other data, it is clear that the birth took place two or three months before the Passover of A.U.C. 750, the year that is known in our chronology as

B.C. 4.

² For this word, see p. 361, n. 1.

³ See 1 Pet. v. 13; Rom. xv. 28; Acts, i. 8; S. Mark, xvi. 20; Rom. i. 8; Col. i. 6, 23. See also below, § 9.

⁴ Heb. ii. 11-17; Is. liii. 3-6.

⁵ S. John, xii. 32; Hos. xi. 4.

⁶ 2 Pet. i. 4; S. John, i. 12; 1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Cor. v. 15; 1 Pet. i. 23; Rev. xxii. 17.

⁷ Tit. iii. 5 (R.V. marg.); Acts, xxii. 16; S. John, iii. 5; Acts, ii. 38, 39; Rom. vi. 4.

⁸ See 1 Cor. xi. 24-29; S. John, vi. 51-58; Heb. ix. 26-28, xiii. 10.

⁹ The early Christians regularly used of one another the beautiful word "brethren," *i.e.* brothers and sisters of one common Father; and the term occurs more than a hundred times in the New Testament. Hence the "Dearly beloved brethren" in our daily services.

one visible Body,¹ known as the Church,² with definite laws and regulations,³ a definite organization⁴ and a promise of definite guidance into all essential truth.⁵

§ 4. *Organization of the Church.*—The Christian converts were, with their whole families,⁶ admitted into the Church invariably by the solemn rite of Baptism. They were taught a form of sound words, the original of our Creed.⁷ After Baptism they were “sealed,” “anointed,” or “confirmed” by the “laying on of hands,” conveying to each believer his share in the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the “common-participation of the Holy Ghost.”⁸ They were placed under the government⁹ of presbyters¹⁰ and deacons,¹¹ chosen

¹ Eph. i. 23, iv. 15, 16; S. John, xv. 1-7, etc. It was to be a *visible* unity which would witness to the world (S. John, xvii. 21).

² Eph. i. 22, 23, iii. 10, v. 24-32; Col. i. 24; 1 Tim. iii. 15; Acts, xx. 28; S. Matt. xvi. 18, xviii. 17.

³ S. Matt. v. 22, 27, etc. ⁴ S. Matt. xviii. 17-18; S. John, xx. 23.

⁵ S. John, xiv. 16, 17, 26, xvi. 13; S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

⁶ Acts, ii. 39, xvi. 15, 33. The *whole households* of Gentile converts, down to the youngest infant, were always baptized by the Jews. See also Gen. xvii. 12, 13; 1 Cor. vii. 14; Eph. vi. 1; S. Mark, x. 14, 15; S. Matt. xviii. 3, compared with S. John, iii. 5 [where note the misrendering, “a man”: it should be translated, “any one” (*τις*)].

⁷ 2 Tim. i. 13; S. Luke, i. 4 (R.V. marg.); Rom. vi. 17. Traces of the Creed are found in 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. vi. 1, 2; and its germ is seen in S. Matt. xxviii. 19.

⁸ 2 Cor. xiii. 14 (*κοινωνία*). For “sealing,” compare Eph. i. 13, iv. 30; for “anointing,” 1 John, ii. 20, 27; for “establishing” or “confirming,” 2 Cor. i. 21, 22, where all three terms occur together; “laying on of hands,” Heb. vi. 2; Acts, viii. 14-17, xix. 2-6. While the extraordinary gifts of Apostolic days were gradually withdrawn from the Church when no longer needed (see the remarkable passage, Iren. “Hær.” ii. 3, § 4, and Euseb. “Hist. Ecc.” v. 7), the ordinary and far more important (1 Cor. xii. 31) gifts remained and remain. Each member of the Church has his individual share in the “diversities of gifts” (1 Cor. xii. 4; Eph. iv. 7).

⁹ 1 Thess. v. 12, 13; Rom. xii. 8; Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24; 1 Tim. v. 17.

¹⁰ Acts, xi. 30, xiv. 23, xv. 4, 6, xvi. 4, xx. 17; 1 Tim. v. 1, 17; Tit. i. 5; James, v. 14; 1 Pet. v. 1; Rev. iv. 4, v. 5, etc. They were called also “bishops,” *i.e.* supervisors (Acts, xx. 28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1-7; Tit. i. 7-9), till the rise of the higher episcopal office, late in the Apostolic age—see below, p. 6. Compare also 1 Pet. ii. 25, and Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Cor. 44.

¹¹ Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8-13. For the origin of the office, see Acts, vi. 1-6.

generally from and by the people, but ordained and commissioned by the Apostles,¹ who retained themselves a supreme control over the Church and the officers they had appointed.²

§ 5. *The Threefold Ministry.*—Apostles, presbyters, and deacons thus formed a threefold cord of Church governance, and one “not” to be “quickly broken” (*Eccl. iv. 12*). For the Church was not left, at the Apostles’ death or withdrawal, to break up into a number of more or less disorganized units, each independent of every other (see § 330 below). Not so could she have converted the world. Already we find S. Paul, towards the close of his ministry, recognizing the coming need by commissioning Timothy and Titus to ordain and confirm, and to exercise supreme control over the Christian congregations *and their presbyters*,³ in the Churches of Ephesus and Crete respectively. And besides the temporary “movable Episcopate” of Timothy and Titus,⁴ there was already in full exercise at Jerusalem the model for the permanent local Episcopate, S. James the Just, the Lord’s brother, wielding there—probably after the withdrawal of the Apostles (*circa A.D. 43*)⁵)—an office identical with

¹ See especially *Acts*, vi. 3, 6, xiv. 23; *2 Tim.* i. 6. The presbyters took part sometimes in ordinations, as they do to this day (*1 Tim.* iv. 14, compared with *2 Tim.* i. 6).

² *Acts*, xx. 17; *1 Cor.* iv. 17-21, v. 3-5, ix. 2, xi. 2, 34, end; *2 Cor.* x. 8-11, xiii. 1-3, 10; *3 John*, 9, 10. This cardinal fact is forgotten or ignored by modern Congregationalism.

³ *1 Tim.* iv. 11, v. 1, 9, 17-22; *2 Tim.* ii. 2; *Tit.* i. 5-11, ii. 15, iii. 10.

⁴ Lightfoot, “Apostolic Fathers,” pt. ii., vol. i., p. 376. From the recently discovered *Didache* it seems likely that the “prophets,” so frequently mentioned in the New Testament (see *Acts*, xi. 27, xiii. 1, xv. 32, xxi. 10; *1 Cor.* xii. 28; *Eph.* ii. 20, iii. 5, iv. 11), took part during this transitory period in the supervision of the Christian communities (see Dr. Gibson, “Thirty-Nine Articles,” pp. 737, 742-744).

⁵ A very early Christian tradition (preserved by Apollonius ap. Euseb. “Hist. Ecc.” v. 18, and by Clement of Alexandria, *Str.* vi. 5) states that the Lord instructed His Apostles (compare *Acts*, i. 3) not to leave Jerusalem for twelve years. The outbreak of Herod’s persecution at the end of that period seems to have been the signal for their with-

that of the later Bishops,¹ in which, after his death by martyrdom (A.D. 63), he was succeeded by S. Symeon, the Lord's cousin.² And there is decisive and overwhelming evidence³ that the Apostle S. John, late in the Apostolic age, and with the co-operation of surviving fellow Apostles, established the historic Episcopate, wielding the *supreme authority* hitherto exercised by the Apostles themselves (see above) under Christ's own appointment, and set it on an authoritative basis in Asia Minor, whence it gradually spread to every Church throughout the world; and that to the higher order⁴ of governance thus instituted became applied the appropriate name of BISHOP, *i.e.* Supervisor, which has ever since been attached to it.⁵

§ 6. *The Bishop and his Diocese.*—Thus came into existence the Christian Bishop, who from Apostolic

drawal (compare Acts, xi. 30, with ver. 1, ch. xii. 25). The special mention of James in ch. xii. 17, appears to indicate that he already occupied the position, in which Christian tradition has always exhibited him, of first “Bishop” of Jerusalem, president, under Apostolic sanction, of the local Church there.

¹ “It seems vain to deny . . . that the position of St. James in the mother Church furnished the precedent and the pattern of the later episcopate.”—LIGHTFOOT, *Essay on the Christian Ministry*, p. 206.

² See Euseb. “Hist. Ecc.” iii. 11, and his express quotation from Hegesippus in iv. 22.

³ The authorities are cited at length by Lightfoot (*l.c.*, p. 212), who remarks that “all historical evidence must be thrown aside as worthless, if testimony so strong can be disregarded.”

⁴ On the sense in which the word “Order” is here used, see below, p. 311.

⁵ Hitherto the presbyters had shared the *name* (above, p. 4. n. 10), but not the office. For the office had not then been created. On the whole question of the rise and authority of the Episcopate, see especially Hooker, “Ecc. Pol.” bk. vii.; Bingham’s “Antiq.” bks. i. and ii.; and Lightfoot’s “Essay on Chr. Min.” supplemented by some important criticisms in Canon Gore’s recent work on the same subject, and by some explanatory utterances of Bishop Lightfoot himself. A short and clear presentment of the facts will be found in Dr. Gibson’s “Thirty-Nine Art.” pp. 732-745. The unsound speculations of Dr. Hatch are examined in the “Ch. Quarterly Review,” July, 1896: and it should be carefully noticed, as materially affecting his conclusions, that Dr. Hatch *rejects* the Pastoral Epistles, and those to the Ephesians and Colossians. See also Dr. Moberly’s weighty work, just published, “Ministerial Priesthood.”

days was in each city the recognized ruler of the whole Christian Church in that city, with his council the presbyters (from among whom he was, as a rule, himself chosen¹) and his assistants the deacons : and this threefold cord of governance the Church has unceasingly retained.² From the city was radiated by degrees the light of Christianity to the "pagan" district round,³ which, gradually won by this means to Christ, became the diocese (*παροικία*), with its ecclesiastical centre still at the city, the place of its Bishop's "sedes" or see.

§ 7. The Episcopate the centre of unity.—Round their ecclesiastical ruler the Bishop, with his presbyters and deacons, rallied in every local centre the faithful Christian flock. He formed the guarantee of unity,⁴

¹ This is S. Jerome's point in the often misunderstood passage, in his Ep. cxlvii. "ad Evang." (See Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." vii. 5. § 6; Bingham's "Antiq." ii. 3. § 5.) The Bishop's origin from, and close connection with, the presbyters (compare even 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 John, 1; 3 John, 1) has been sometimes obscured, but never forgotten, in the Church. On the tendency of some modern English Bishops to *autocracy* instead of *constitutional* rule, and on the limits of the obedience they can properly require, see some trenchant remarks in Canon MacColl's "Lawlessness, Sacerdotalism, and Ritualism," pp. 465-467.

² "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons" (Preface to the English Ordinal in our Prayer Book). These words are emphatically endorsed by Bishop Lightfoot (Pref. to the 6th ed. of his "Comm. on Phil."), as the result of his own minute investigations in his famous Essay.

³ The word "pagan" (Lat. *pagus*, a village) itself tells of the time when heathenism still lingered in the country places, after the Christianizing of the towns.

⁴ See Lightfoot, "Essay on Chr. Min." p. 235. The Scriptural phrase of "churches" is strangely perverted by modern Dissent, as though it meant or justified the multiplication of independent sects in every town. Only the thoughtless or unwary can fail to see that each of the New Testament "churches" is, within its local limits, absolutely at unity, and that any tendency to disintegration is severely rebuked and unsparingly condemned. The Christians of each place belong to the one Church of that place and are under the rule of its appointed officers, and are *not* at liberty to break away and set up ministers of their own. Compare p. 270, n. 4.

and also of the faithful maintenance of Apostolic doctrine. To the carefully maintained succession of Bishops belonged the recognized duty of holding fast "THE TRADITIONS" (2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 2, R.V.) and handing faithfully down the original "Deposit" (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14, R.V. marg.) of the Christian Faith through all the raging storms of false doctrine, heresy, and schism, which began to burst upon the Church even before the Apostles themselves had passed away.¹ To the Bishops and their unbroken continuity in the infant Church we owe a debt which is very seldom adequately realized, but which is in fact incalculable.

§ 8. *Christianity in Britain: Traditions.*—The Faith thus being preached with burning zeal through the known world, must speedily have reached Britain also; but when we ask how or when it came, we are left to grope among dim and most uncertain traditions. Gildas, the earliest native historian (sixth century), frankly confesses² that the old records, "if any there had ever been," had been irrevocably scattered in the storm of the fierce English invasions in the fifth century (§ 20 below). He indicates, however, that the "rays" of Christianity were "received" here while the Romans were securing the country after Boadicea's revolt (A.D. 61),³ and this hint may possibly be supplemented by the statement in the Greek kalendar under March 15th, that ARISTOBULUS "accompanied S. Paul as his minister in his preaching throughout the world, and was by him sent to Britain as Bishop, where he founded churches and suffered martyrdom." The Welsh tradi-

¹ The later books of the New Testament are full of allusions to this. See 1 Tim. i. 6, 19, 20, iv. 1, 16, vi. 3-5, 20, 21; 2 Tim. ii. 16-18, iii. 1-9, iv. 3, 4, 14, 15; Tit. iii. 9-11; 2 Pet. ii.; 1 John, ii. 18, 19, iv. 1-3; 2 John, 10, 11; Jude, *passim*; Rev. ii. 6, 15.

² "Hist." § 4.

³ The word "Interea" seems to imply this. (The words "tempore, ut scimus, summo Tiberii Cæsaris" refer to the general rise of Christianity, and not to Britain in particular.)

tion of Bran the Blessed¹ actually states that he was accompanied to Britain, among others, by *Arwystli*, i.e. Aristobulus, who is called Bran's "spiritual instructor";² and this mission of Aristobulus (mentioned in Rom. xvi. 10 as one of the companions of S. Paul) would satisfy Theodoret's declaration (in the fifth century) that S. Paul went to Spain and also "brought the Benefit ($\tauὴν ὠφέλειαν$) to the islands lying in the sea." S. Paul was released from his two years' imprisonment at Rome (Acts, xxviii. 30) probably in A.D. 64, and therefore shortly after the Boadicean revolt; and, if he then paid his long-planned visit to Spain (Rom. xv. 24, 28),³ it is probable that he would not altogether forget the great island in the Western sea, which the Romans were engaged in annexing to their empire *at that very time*. He may, therefore, have sent Aristobulus and others thither as missionaries, under the guidance of British converts already made at Rome. But on these dim figures of Britain's earliest missionaries, if earliest missionaries they were, a thick veil of darkness immediately descends. All other traditions may be summarily dismissed. The Roman story that one of the early Bishops of Rome, Eleutherius,⁴ sent a mission hither in A.D. 167 at the request of a British King, Lucius, dates from the sixth century,⁵ was quite unknown to Gildas, has been shown to be entirely untrustworthy in its details,⁶ and is un-

¹ Father of the captured British chief Caradoc or Caractacus, said to have been converted by S. Paul at Rome, and to have returned to evangelize his countrymen.

² See Archdeacon Williams's "Ecc. Hist. of the Cymry" (quoted by Freeman, "Princ. of Divine Serv." vol. iii., p. 424).

³ For the actual visit to Spain we have not only the just cited testimony of Theodoret (in Ps. cxvi.), but also that of S. Paul's younger contemporary, S. Clement. His expression, $\epsilon\piὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών$ (ad Cor. 5), written from *Rome*, can only mean Spain or Britain.

⁴ I.e. Eleutherus, who, however, did not become Bishop of Rome till A.D. 177.

⁵ It was obtained by Bede, and inserted in his History, from a late "Catalogue of Roman Pontiffs," compiled at Rome in A.D. 530.

⁶ See Haddan and Stubbs, "Councils," i. 25.

hesitatingly relegated by the best modern writers to the region of romance. The beautiful mediæval legend of S. Joseph of Arimathæa and the Holy Thorn of Glastonbury is not heard of till the twelfth century, when it is mentioned by the Norman monk and chronicler, William of Malmesbury. It bears witness, however, to a belief, probable on other grounds, that Glastonbury (whose Keltic name was *Ynis-vitrym*, and then *Avalon*) was a British Christian settlement from very early times indeed.

§ 9. *Christianity in Britain: Certainties.*—But, leaving the shifting quagmire of tradition, we know at any rate that the new Faith must soon have reached our island with the traders and colonists who followed in the wake of the Roman armies, which were subduing and civilizing it at the very time¹ when S. Paul was preaching so successfully (Phil. i. 12-14; Acts, xxviii. 30, 31) at Rome. And we have the express assertions of Justin Martyr in A.D. 140 that Christianity was then prevalent in every country known to the Romans;² of Irenæus in A.D. 177, that the Church was spread “through the whole world unto the ends of the earth”;³ of Tertullian, twenty years later, that “even parts of Britain to which the Romans had not penetrated” had been “subdued to Christ”;⁴ and of Origen (A.D. 240) that Christianity had reached the Britons, though, as he states elsewhere, to many of them it was yet unknown.⁵ The Faith, whenever and however introduced—and the story of its earliest pioneers has been long since buried in oblivion—was doubtless propagated, here as elsewhere, by mission settlements,

¹ The Roman occupation under Claudius had begun in A.D. 43.

² Just. Mart. c. Tryph. 117.

³ Iren. “Hær.” i. 2, καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἔως περάτων τῆς γῆς διεσπαρμένη.

⁴ Tert. adv. Jud. c. 7: “Et Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita.” (The parts of our island north of the Clyde and the Forth were never in the Roman occupation.)

⁵ Origen, Hom. iv. in Ezech.; vi. in Luc.; xxviii. in Matt. xxiv.

which, as they rooted, received Bishops and became themselves centres of further missionary efforts.

§ 10. *The First Three Centuries.*—Thus passed away three centuries of Christianity, centuries rich with fair fruitage in the Church at large, and fragrant with the memories of Christian Doctors and Fathers, Saints and Martyrs, noble champions of truth against error within and bitter heathen persecutions without. To these centuries belong, in particular, the great names of Clement, Bishop of Rome († A.D. 100); Ignatius and Polycarp, Bishops of Antioch and Smyrna (martyred in A.D. 107 and 155 respectively); Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, in the middle of the second century; Justin Martyr the Apologist (martyred in A.D. 166); Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons from A.D. 177; Tertullian, the great Latin Father (A.D. 160-220); Julius Africanus, the learned chronologist († A.D. 232); Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus (martyred in A.D. 235); Clement of Alexandria († *circa* A.D. 220) and his brilliant pupil Origen (tortured in the Decian persecution of A.D. 251); Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 248-65); Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem (martyred in A.D. 251); Minucius Felix the Apologist (*circa* A.D. 200); and Cyprian, the great Bishop of Carthage (martyred in A.D. 268). But in all the array of saints and theologians¹ there is not one of British nationality, and no record of any share taken by our then distant and barbarous island in the common affairs of Christianity. Everything goes to show the truth of the statement of Gildas that the “rays” of Christianity “were received with lukewarm minds by the inhabitants” of these islands, until the outbreak of the last and fiercest persecution, that of “the tyrant Diocletian” in A.D. 303, when God “kindled up among us bright luminaries of holy martyrs.”²

¹ See also Appendix P, pp. 354-355.

² Gildas, §§ 9, 10 (Bohn’s translation). Compare Bede, “Hist. Ecc.” i. 4, end.

§ 11. *The Fourth Century. S. Alban.*—The storm of this terrible Diocletian persecution, a systematic and world-wide effort of the Roman government to *stamp out Christianity*, was felt even in far-off Britain. The first known martyr was S. Alban, a Roman settler, who sheltered out of pity one of the fugitive British clergy, and being converted by him, nobly laid down his life for Christ near Verulam (A.D. 304).¹ “Aaron” and “Julius,” and others “of both sexes,” Gildas tells us, also suffered martyrdom, and the “churches” of Britain were “levelled to the ground.”² The persecution seems, however, to have been comparatively mild here; and it ceased altogether three years later, at the accession of Constantine, afterwards the first Christian Emperor.

§ 12. *Constantine the Great. British Bishops abroad.*—This Diocletian persecution has given us, at the beginning of the fourth century, our first *distinct* glimpse of the British Church. The father of Constantine, Constantius Chlorus, who had since A.D. 292 governed Spain, Gaul, and Britain with the rank of Emperor, died at York (*Ebrauc, Eboracum*) in A.D. 306, and his son Constantine was proclaimed Emperor there. Six years later he became, by hard fighting, supreme in the whole West, and at once published the famous Edict of Milan, establishing *universal religious toleration* (A.D. 313); and the Christian churches, so recently demolished by the heathen persecutors, were re-erected with the greatest joy throughout the empire. And now we obtain our second glimpse—and a very important one it is—of the Christian Church of this country. Among the two hundred Bishops whom Constantine assembled at the Council of Arles (A.D. 314) to heal the African schism of the Donatists, we find three present from Britain, Eborius, Bishop of YORK,

¹ The town of S. Albans grew up later around his shrine. This British protomartyr is commemorated on June 17th (Appendix P, p. 356).

² Gildas, §§ 10, 12.

Restitutus, Bishop of LONDON, and Adelfius, Bishop of either CAERLEON or LINCOLN;¹ and they were accompanied by a presbyter, named Sacerdos, and a deacon, named Arminius, also from Britain (compare § 7).

§ 13. *The Council of Nicæa.*—When the Emperor Constantine became at length, ten years later, master also of the eastern half of the empire, he summoned the Christian Bishops of the whole world to the great Council of Nicæa, a city of Asia Minor. To this First General Council came,² it is said, three hundred and eighteen Bishops, including even a Metropolitan of India and a Bishop of the Goths, both ruling outside the bounds of the Roman Empire. The British Bishops were summoned with the rest,³ but they seem not to have personally attended, probably on account of the immense distance to be traversed. The primary work of this great Council (A.D. 325) was the re-affirmation of the essential Divinity of our Lord, which had been called in question by Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria and founder of the Arian (now represented by the *Unitarian*) heresy. The “Nicene Creed,” which is recited by the Church Universal at every celebration of the Holy Eucharist, was drawn up by the Council, on the basis of older creeds (compare § 4), as far as the words “Holy Ghost,” the remainder being added by the Second General Council of A.D. 381 (see below). Besides this, the Nicene Council settled the long-vexed question as to the date of keeping Easter (compare § 31), rejected a proposal to oblige all married clergy to put away their wives, and recognized a primacy (not dominion) of three Churches over the others: the Church of ROME over the West,

¹ The name in the list is “Colonia Londinensium.” Lindensium (*i.e.* Lincoln) has been suggested. But the name we should expect would be Caerleon, the *third* chief city of Roman Britain.

² See Dean Stanley, “Eastern Church,” p. 94.

³ This follows from the express statement of Eusebius (“Vit. Const.” 3. 7), that the Emperor summoned Bishops out of all provinces. The British Church accepted the decrees of the Council (3. 19; Athanas. “Ad Jov. Imp.”).

the Church of ANTIOCH over the East, and the Church of ALEXANDRIA over Africa, as these were then the three chief cities of the *civil* government. To these was shortly afterwards to be added (by the Second General Council) CONSTANTINOPLE, the great city which Constantine had just founded, and to which he, shortly after the Nicene Council, transferred the seat of government permanently from Rome.¹

§ 14. *The Battle for the Creed.*—The next few years were a sad and weary time of intestine conflict. The Arian heresy unhappily infected the new Emperor Constantius and his Court; and his high-handed efforts to force it upon the Church at large led to the memorable contest for the Faith—the famous struggle of ATHANASIUS CONTRA MUNDUM.² On the one side was the world-power, on the other the tenacity of Christian certainty. Numerous lesser Councils were held in various parts of the world, one of which in particular, at Ariminum (Rimini) in A.D. 359, gained an evil notoriety by assenting, under extreme pressure, to an ambiguously-worded Arian formula. But the steadfastness of the great Fathers, Athanasius, Basil, and the two Gregories (§ 16) and others, ultimately prevailed: the flood of heresy soon ebbed, and in A.D. 381, eight years after the death of Athanasius, the Emperor Theodosius convened at Constantinople, his capital, the Second General Council. By this great Council of one hundred and fifty Bishops the Nicene Creed was confirmed and promulgated anew, with the addition, as we have seen, of the concluding clauses, necessary against the followers of an ex-Patriarch of Constantinople, Macedonius, who in A.D. 360 had initiated heresy

¹ The permanent withdrawal of the Emperor's Court gave the Bishop of Rome a freer position, and helped considerably the development of the Papal claims, which, gradually becoming more and more pretentious, have ended in wrecking the outward unity of the Church (§ 97, end).

² Athanasius was Bishop of Alexandria for forty-six years, from A.D. 328 to 373. On the Creed which is called by his name, see p. 19, n. 3, and Appendix N, p. 345.

with regard to the Holy Spirit.¹ The Council also rejected the strange theory of Apollinarius that our Lord had no human soul,² a heresy which marks the opening of the Incarnation controversies (§ 19).

§ 15. *The Importance of Episcopacy.*—From the very earliest times, from even Apostolic days, system after system of heresy and false doctrine had arisen and dashed itself against the Church. The appalling catalogue of these early heresies, some of which had troubled the last days of S. Paul, and S. Peter, and S. John, and S. Jude,³ can be read in any Ecclesiastical History. What is too often forgotten is that the battle for the Faith was fought and won, humanly speaking, solely by the compact Episcopal organization which the Apostles left behind them, clothed with their own authority, and able to oppose the unbroken front of Apostolic tradition to every fresh heresy, or phase of a heresy, as it appeared. Some of these early heresies are long since dead ; but very many have reappeared under different names, again and again, in the long history of the Church, and especially in the great upheaval of the Reformation period (compare p. 248, n. 1). Some of them flourish in our own midst to-day, ill weeds in the fair garden of Truth ; and much of their power to injure individual souls arises from our own unhappy divisions. Is it wonderful that Churchmen long for recovered unity on the basis of Catholicity ? and that they feel indignant with those who needlessly break the ranks ? Is an army, marching out to war against bitter foes, content with anything less than a compact and organized unity ?⁴ Is there any of the *best* work of the

¹ “Creaturam esse dicentes.”—AUG. *Hær.* 52. Compare Hooker, “Ecc. Pol.” v. 52, 1.

² Hence the clause in the Athanasian Creed, “of a reasonable *soul* and human flesh subsisting.” See S. Matt. xxvi. 38 ; S. John, xii. 27.

³ See p. 8, n. 1.

⁴ Compare Col. ii. 5, *τάξιν*; Phil. i. 27 (A.V.) ; Cant. vi. 4, 10 ; Clem. ad Cor. 37. See below, Appendix R.

sects that they could not do with tenfold effect within the ranks of the Church, and under the control and guidance of her Bishops? Who that at all realizes the immense weakness and waste of force that religious anarchy brings can stand aloof as the member of a modern sect, when his birthright is the *unsectarian Church of England*?¹

§ 16. Saints and Doctors of the Fourth Century. British Bishops at Ariminum (Rimini).—To the stormy period of the fourth century belong the memorable names of Lactantius; Eusebius of Cæsarea, the earliest Church historian; S. Athanasius of Alexandria; S. Hilary of Poitiers; S. Basil the Great, and S. Gregory of Nyssa, his brother; S. Gregory of Nazianzus, and his saintly sister Gorgonia; the blind teacher Didymus of Alexandria; S. Antony, the famous hermit; Pachomius, the inventor of monasticism, which Athanasius introduced to the West in his visit to Rome, A.D. 341; Epiphanius, Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, and a learned writer against heresies; S. Cyril of Jerusalem; S. Ephraem, the Syrian hermit, famous as a poet, orator, and divine; and S. Ambrose of Milan.² At the above mentioned Council of Ariminum (§ 14) we again find three Bishops from Britain present; and there is an interesting allusion to their poverty. There is abundance of other evidence for the recognized position at this time of the British Church as a branch of the Church Catholic. SS. Hilary, Athanasius himself, Chrysostom, and Jerome all testify to its existence and its orthodoxy.

§ 17. The Fifth Century. Pelagianism. S. German

¹ It is necessary to note in passing the curious misuse of language in our own days, which applies the terms “undenominational,” “unsectarian,” to the system which endeavours to stereotype and perpetuate the existing divisions among ourselves, and thus plays effectively into the hands of Rome.

² S. Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, S. Jerome, and S. Augustine belong to the close of the fourth and opening of the fifth century. See also Appendix P, pp. 356-357.

in Britain.—Early in the fifth century (A.D. 409) a monk from Britain, named Pelagius, who for ten years had been living in Rome and was held in high repute there, began, with his friend and pupil Cœlestius, to attract great attention by novel teaching on the mysterious subject of Free Will. In over-hasty zeal for Christian morality, he was led to cut away its real basis altogether by denying man's birth in original sin, and the necessity of God's antecedent grace (see Art. ix. at the end of our Prayer-Book).¹ His views were supported with much learning and eloquence, and even won the assent for a time of the Roman Bishop, Zosimus.² But they were denounced and refuted by (among others) the greatest of the Latin Fathers, S. Augustine, at this time virtually the head of the African Church (not to be confused with S. Augustine of Canterbury, who lived more than a century later). Pelagianism, as the new heresy was called, was condemned at Rome in A.D. 418; and finally, with Nestorianism, at the Third General Council of Ephesus, in A.D. 431 (see below). In A.D. 429, at the earnest request of the British Church, the neighbouring Church of Gaul (France) sent over hither two of her Bishops, S. German of Auxerre and Lupus of Troyes, to stop the progress of the heresy, which was being sedulously propagated in this country. They held a great synod at Verulam, which was followed by the bloodless "Alleluia" victory over the Picts and Saxons in the Lent of A.D. 430. (The spot in Wales where it occurred is still called *Maes Garmon*, i.e. the field of German.) In A.D. 447 S. German paid a second visit, with Severus, Bishop of Treves: Pelagianism was finally repudiated, and a great outburst of religious zeal took place.

§ 18. *S. Ninian in Scotland. S. Patrick in Ireland.*—Two British missionaries of this period have attained

¹ See Canon Bright, "Waymarks of Ch. Hist." pp. 185-193, 201-204.

² On this Pelagian Pope, see Canon Bright, *op. cit.*, p. 191, n. 3, and compare below, p. 45, n. 4.

to special fame. S. Ninian, a native of Cumbria who had studied at Rome, and also with the great S. Martin of Tours,¹ settled, about A.D. 410, as missionary Bishop among the Southern Picts in Valentia (Galloway), and made his headquarters at Whithorn, *i.e.* "White House," so called because the church he erected there was constructed, after the Roman fashion, of stone, instead of being merely built of wood and covered with reed, after the usual British method.² S. Patrick was a British Christian, born in Scotland at a place called from him Kilpatrick, *i.e.* S. Patrick's Cell, near Dumbarton, and related on his mother's side to S. Martin of Tours. The facts of his life are almost buried under a mass of picturesque and fanciful legend : we know, however, that he was carried to Ireland by pirates when sixteen years old ; that, in obedience, as he tells us himself, to a heavenly vision, he returned thither and devoted his life to its evangelization, taking up the work from which, as it seems, Palladius (sent as a missionary Bishop by the Pope in A.D. 431) had just been driven by the wild Irish ; that he landed in Ireland in A.D. 432 ; and that he established the see of Armagh and numerous monasteries before his death in A.D. 493.

§ 19. The Incarnation Controversies in the Fifth Century.—The Eastern mind, unlike the Western, delights in subtle speculation.³ Not content with the controversies of the fourth century, which had been settled by the First and Second General Councils (§§ 13, 14), the Easterns passed on in this fifth century to an elaborate investigation of the whole mode and method of the Incarnation, an investigation which forced upon the Church the necessity of discriminating what was true from what was false in the teachings

¹ See Appendix P, p. 357.

² Compare Bede, iii. 25, *init.*

³ On the speculative tendency of Eastern theology as opposed to the practical tendency of that of the West, see Dean Stanley's "Eastern Church," pp. 22-25.

put forward. Hence two further General Councils were held in the course of this century—that of Ephesus in A.D. 431 (summoned by the Emperor Theodosius II.), and that of Chalcedon in A.D. 451 (summoned by the Emperor Marcian), which condemned Nestorianism and Eutychianism respectively. The former heresy denied our Lord's *Oneness of Person*; the latter denied, at the other extreme of error, the distinction of the *Two Natures*, Human and Divine, in His One Person.¹ The whole long controversy was conducted with incredible heat and violence, and raged throughout the whole century and even beyond it. The disgust, however, with which we read the sad details of human pride and infirmity must not be allowed to blind us to the importance of the issues involved (see below, § 53). The chief opponent of Nestorius was the violent and impulsive S. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria: in the subsequent controversy against Eutyches Theodoret, the great Church commentator and historian, took a prominent part; and a masterly treatise of the contemporary Pope, Leo the Great,² on the whole question—the famous “Tome of S. Leo”—was adopted by the Fourth General Council, and “has ever since been a standard of orthodoxy.”³ But to finally clear the

¹ See on the whole subject the famous chapters in Hooker's Fifth Book. (a) Nestorius took exception to the word “Theotokos” applied to the Virgin Mary, which implies that the birth of our Lord was the birth of One *already God*, and not of One to whom the Divine Nature was afterwards imparted. The exquisite theologic accuracy of this Greek word can only be clumsily expressed in English by the paraphrase “Mother of God.” The Latins coined for it the word “Deipara.” (b) Eutyches, an aged presbyter of Constantinople, in the reaction against Nestorianism, fell into the opposite error of teaching that our Lord's Human Nature was entirely absorbed in the Divine at their union, and thus destroying its reality—an error remarkably parallel with that of the Romanists as to Transubstantiation. (See Pearson on the Creed, Art. iii. and notes.)

² Bishop of Rome, A.D. 440-61.

³ To an earlier part of this fifth century belongs probably the famous psalm, “Quicunque vult,” commonly called the Creed of S. Athanasius. Its origin can be traced to Gaul, and its unknown author may have been S. Vincent of Lerins. See further, Appendix N, p. 345.

doctrine of the Incarnation of all the possible modes of misstatement, two more General Councils had to be held, one in the sixth and one in the seventh century, as we shall see hereafter (§§ 21, 53).

§ 20. *Britain invaded by the English.*—The gradual breaking up of the Roman Empire by swarms of Northern barbarians, which began early in the fifth century, obliged the Romans, in A.D. 410, to finally relinquish their hold on Britain, and recall all their troops from the island.¹ And in the year 449 our own fierce ancestors, the heathen English and Saxons and Jutes, began to pour into the country from their German homes across the sea. Their conflict with the native British was terrible and protracted. Knowing nothing of Christ, they ruthlessly burned down His sanctuaries, profaned His altars, and slew His priests and people with the sword. The Britons, fighting fiercely, were gradually pushed back to the west parts of the island, the wild mountains and forests of Wales, Cornwall, Cumbria, and Strathclyde, where they were at last able to make an effectual stand, and where their descendants still live. To this period of desperate conflict with the heathen belongs the prowess of the British King Arthur, whose story has come down to us in so dense a mist of legend and romance : his famous victory at Badon Hill (probably Badbury in Dorset) is dated in A.D. 520. Gradually, as the invaders settled down, the country they had conquered became divided up into a number of little kingdoms, many of which are now counties in England (§ 25).

§ 21. *The Sixth Century. Fifth General Council.*—The two great religious errors of the fifth century, Nestorianism and Eutychianism (§ 19), had different fates. Nestorianism, fiercely proscribed after the Council of Ephesus, fled beyond the boundaries of the Roman

¹ In the same year, 410, Alaric and his Goths sacked Rome itself ; and Pelagius (§ 17), who was an eye-witness, has left an account of it. The seat of government had been removed eight years before to Ravenna.

Empire and took refuge in Persia, where a Church was founded whose missionaries spread a knowledge of Christianity throughout Central Asia, and even to China and India.¹ Eutychianism, on the other hand, lived on in the great Monophysite, *i.e.* *One Nature*,² party with its centre at Alexandria, which for another hundred years convulsed the East. At length the Fifth General Council, summoned by the Emperor Justinian, and held at Constantinople in A.D. 553, while condemning the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who had led Nestorius astray, of Theodoret against Cyril, and of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa (the so-called "Three Chapters"), on the other hand confirmed the result of the Council of Chalcedon. Monophysitism then gradually died out, except in the native (Coptic) Church of Egypt (which had broken away in A.D. 537), its offshoot the Church of Abyssinia, the Jacobites in Syria, and the Armenians. These, though now all sunk in apathy and ignorance, still confront the Orthodox Greek Church in those regions.³

§ 22. The British Church in Wales. S. David. S. Kentigern. Gildas the Wise.—The British Church, driven forcibly back to Wales (§ 2), took fresh root there, and retained a vigorous life, though severed henceforth from the rest of Christendom by a solid wedge of heathenism. We hear of great monasteries with numerous non-diocesan Bishops, of Church synods, and of famous saints, especially S. David, the patron saint of Wales, who died probably in A.D. 601.⁴ S. Kentigern, the "Apostle of Scotland," revived the work of S. Ninian (§ 18) among the Southern Picts

¹ The Archbishop of Canterbury's "Assyrian Mission" is an attempt to raise from the dust, by patient teaching, the down-trodden remnant of this once-powerful Church, another fragment of which consists of the "Christians of S. Thomas" in India.

² See p. 19.

³ See Stanley, "Eastern Church," pp. 5-14, and Canon Bright, "Waymarks," pp. 399, 400. See also below, § 53.

⁴ See Appendix P, p. 358.

in A.D. 573, and became Bishop of Glasgow.¹ Gildas the Wise, famous as the native describer of the English Conquest (§ 8), headed in A.D. 565 a special mission to Ireland, which revived and encouraged the struggling Irish Church, the fruit of S. Patrick's labours ; and he died there five years later.

§ 23. *The Church of Ireland. Her missionary zeal.*—Ireland, reinvigorated by the mission under Gildas, speedily rose to world-wide fame as the “Island of Saints,” a home of learned students and of enthusiastic missionaries to the ignorant barbarians on the Continent, who had now flooded province after province of what had been the Roman Empire. S. Columban, one of the greatest of these missionaries, was the “Apostle of Burgundy,” and laboured not only in France but in Switzerland and Lombardy (maintaining, it may be noted, everywhere his independence of the rising power of the Roman Church²), and numbers of famous continental monasteries of after-times owed their foundation to his unwearied efforts (A.D. 589-615). His disciple, S. Gall, is revered as the “Apostle of Switzerland.” Missionaries from Ireland are said to have found their way even to Iceland.

§ 24. *S. Columba at Iona.*—But among them all none has obtained greater fame than S. Columba, a native of Donegal, of the Irish blood-royal, who, after twenty years of devoted labour in Ireland, sailed over in A.D. 563 to Scotland with twelve companions to convert the Northern Picts, in bitter remorse for a blood-feud which he had provoked. He settled on the little island, Hii or I (IONA),³ on the west coast of Scotland, and

¹ The present see of S. Asaph in Wales was founded by him in A.D. 583.

² “The relation of the Celtic Churches to Rome was one of veneration without subjection, as is manifest from the language of such a typical Celtic saint as Columban.”—CANON BRIGHT.

³ This name is the Hebrew equivalent of Columba, *i.e.* Dove. Hebrew was known and studied by these monks, and the coincidence can hardly be accidental.

built there a monastery which became the parent of numerous others and a centre of widespread missionary effort throughout the country. He died thirty-four years later, on June 9th, A.D. 597, just eight days after King Ethelbert's baptism in far-distant Kent (see § 28). Famous indeed in after years that humble mission settlement at Iona became, as the head and centre of Scottish Christianity. For generations the Kings of Scotland, with many others of Royal or noble blood, were buried there ; and Iona was destined, as we shall see, to share with S. Augustine's mission the honour of converting the English to Christianity.

§ 25. *The English "Heptarchy."*—There was continually going on all this while a steady intercommunication of mission workers between Ireland, Cornwall, Wales, and North Britain. But the heathen Saxon and English invaders were left severely to themselves : no British Christian even attempted the task of converting our forefathers, these ferocious and detested worshippers of Woden and Thor, who settled down finally into seven chief kingdoms (the "Heptarchy")—Kent, Sussex (*South Saxons*), Essex (*East Saxons*), East Anglia (comprising *North-folk* and *South-folk*, Norfolk and Suffolk), Wessex (*West Saxons*), Mercia (men of the *March*, or British border), and Northumbria. This fierce, uncouth, untamed English race, living by war and plunder—who was likely to be able to convert it to the religion of Jesus, the religion of Love and Peace ?

CHAPTER II

THE CONVERSION OF THE ENGLISH

“Responsum est quod *Angli* vocarentur. At ille *Bene* inquit nam et *Angelicam* habent faciem, et tales *Angelorum* in cælis decet esse cohæredes.”—BEDE, ii. I.

“Few can have less sympathy than I have with the distinctive specialities of the Church of Rome; but in spite of what we hold to be her many and most serious errors she is, by the free acknowledgment of our own formularies, a Church, and a Christian Church, and has been pre-eminently a mother of saints, and many of her Popes have been good and noble and holy men, and vast benefactors of the world, and splendid maintainers of the Faith of Christ; and I refuse to regard them as ‘sons of perdition’ or representatives of blasphemy and lawlessness, or to consider the destruction of their line with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord as the one thing to be looked forward to with joy at the coming of Him who we believe will welcome many of them, and myriads of those who accept their rule, into the blessed company of His redeemed.”—DEAN FARRAR, *Life of St. Paul*, p. 350, n. 2 (on 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.).

§ 26. *The “Italian Mission” to England. S. Augustine.*—Britain, which had been a home for Christians almost from the beginning of Christianity itself (§ 9), was, as we have seen, plunged back into heathenism by the arrival and settlement here of our own English forefathers. Nearly a century and a half had now passed away—a century and a half of warfare and cruel bloodshed—when this dark weltering mass of heathenism fell under the pitying eye of the good and famous Gregory the Great. The beautiful story of his visit to the slave market at Rome, and his curiosity about the fair-faced, long-haired Yorkshire lads¹ there exposed for sale, has been preserved to us by Bede. A few years afterwards the saintly Gregory became Bishop of Rome (A.D. 590); and in the spring of A.D. 597 a band

¹ The kingdom of Deira corresponded roughly to our Yorkshire.

of missionaries sent by him and led by Augustine, prior of Gregory's own Benedictine monastery at Rome and specially selected by him for the arduous enterprise, landed in fear and trembling on the shores of Kent, at Ebbsfleet, in the Isle of Thanet.¹ Though now only a county in England, Kent was then an independent Jutish kingdom, with its capital at CANTERBURY.²

§ 27. *The Roman Missionaries in Kent.*—The moment was a favourable one. Ethelbert, the powerful King of Kent, whose authority reached northward as far as to the Humber, had married, many years before, a Christian princess, Bertha, daughter of the King of Paris; and the chaplain whom she had brought with her, Luidhard, Bishop of Senlis, had already been conducting Christian worship in an old British church which had been built in the far-distant Roman times,³ and was rescued by the new Queen from long ruin and desecration. With what deep feelings do we visit that old church now, the little church of S. Martin by Canterbury! There Roman and British Christians had worshipped and prayed before the heathen came; and there S. Augustine and his little band of missionaries knelt, when over all the rest of England "thick darkness brooded yet."

§ 28. *The Conversion of Kent.*—Soon, however, King Ethelbert and many of the nobles of his Court were converted and baptized (Whitsun-Eve, A.D. 597), and Augustine, crossing back to Gaul, was consecrated in November by Virgilius, the Metropolitan of Arles, "Archbishop for the English,"⁴ and became the first of the long line of Archbishops of Canterbury, which has gone on ever since in unbroken sequence, the present Archbishop being the ninety-third in the long succession

¹ Near Ramsgate. The spot close by, where they first met the King of Kent, is now marked by a memorial cross.

² *Cantwarabyrig*, i.e. the "burgh of the Kentish men."

³ "Ecclesia in honorem sancti Martini [see above, § 18] antiquitus facta, dum adhuc Romani Britanniam incolerent."—BEDE, i. 26.

⁴ "Archiepiscopus genti Anglorum."—BEDE, i. 27.

from S. Augustine.¹ Old churches, long in ruins, and the lands which had belonged to them, were now given back, and others with them, to the service of God ; and thus that gradual *endowment* of the Church began, which some so ignorantly ascribe to Parliament ! On the site of one of those old Roman churches Canterbury Cathedral itself now stands. King Ethelbert had been baptized on the eve of Whit-Sunday,² and the following Christmas Day saw the baptism of ten thousand of the men of Kent in the River Swale. Thus speedily was Kent converted to Christ ; but very much more remained to be done. The honour of converting the greater part of the rest of England was to fall, however, not to this Roman mission in Kent, but mainly to later missionary efforts connected with the Keltic Church of Scotland, itself an offshoot from the older Church of Ireland (§ 24).

§ 29. *S. Gregory and England.*—The good news from Kent thrilled S. Gregory's anxious heart with joy. In A.D. 601 he sent to Augustine the pall and other gifts by a fresh body of missionaries, including three who afterwards became Bishops, Mellitus, Justus, and Paulinus (see below). The *pallium*, or pall, originally a robe of honour granted as a special mark of distinction by the Roman *Emperor* to patriarchs and other Church dignitaries, had gradually become a grant from the Pope (see p. 14, n. 1) as a sign of honour and especially of confirmation of the Metropolitan dignity, although it was not till later times that it became looked upon as necessary to convey Metropolitan power.³ It is a stole of fine white lamb's-wool, decked with four purple

¹ See Appendix B, The Archbishops of Canterbury.

² Hence probably this memorable Sunday's English name, from the white robes worn by those baptized on the eve of the Festival. The modern idea that *Whitsun* is a corruption of *Pentecosten* is quite untenable : see Professor Skeat, Dict. s.v. The beautiful name "Good Friday" for the Lord's Death-day is similarly peculiar to the English Church.

³ It was, however, either fetched by, or sent to, the successive Archbishops, and served as an important link of connection with Rome.

crosses, and with pendants before and behind reaching nearly to the feet: a representation of it appears on the arms of the see of Canterbury.

§ 30. Scheme of Organization. Origin of the National Liturgy.—In a long letter to Augustine, sent with the new missionaries, S. Gregory sketched out an elaborate plan of organization for the nascent English Church. There were to be, according to his scheme, two Archbishops, one at York and one at London (the two chief cities in earlier times),¹ each with twelve Bishops under him, and each taking precedence of the other according to seniority of consecration. And for the “new Church of the English” Augustine was counselled to draw up a service-book of its own, by free adaptation and selection from all available sources.² Thus, instead of the Roman Liturgy, the Church of England had her own National Use,³ still essentially preserved in our Book of Common Prayer (see § 283) and differing in characteristic features from the Roman Use, which the “Roman Catholics” have adopted in their revolt from the National Church of this land.⁴

§ 31. Augustine and the British Bishops.—Thus fortified and encouraged, the new Archbishop proceeded, in accordance with S. Gregory’s commission,⁵

¹ See § 12. The transference of the metropolitan see from Canterbury to London has never been carried out, having been decisively rejected, after the death of Augustine, by the English Witan. See Canon Bright, “Early Eng. Ch. Hist.” p. 97, n. 1.

² Bede, i. 27, II.

³ The variations from the Roman Liturgy are taken from the Gallican Use, which had come in very early days from Ephesus to Lyons, and thence spread over Gaul and Britain and Spain. S. Augustine had become acquainted with it in his slow journey through Gaul to Britain, and had found it already in use at Canterbury (§ 27). It was also the Use of the old British Church in Wales.

⁴ See Prof. Blunt on Book of C. Prayer, Introd. to Communion Serv.

⁵ “Britanniarum vero omnes episcopos tuæ fraternitati committimus, ut indocti doceantur, infirmi persuasione roborentur, perversi auctoritate corriganter.”—BEDE, i. 27, VII. With such stretches of power we become familiar in studying the history of the Roman Church. (See § 23.)

to open communication with the British Church (§ 22), and call upon its Bishops to accept his supremacy and unite with him for the conversion of the English. At a place known afterwards as Augustine's Oak—probably at Down Ampney, near Cricklade¹—a conference called the “Synod of the Oak” took place in A.D. 602-3. There were no differences of doctrine found between the two Churches, but merely some divergences in custom due partly to the long isolation of the Keltic Churches. “Where the faith is one, differences of custom do no harm to Holy Church” is a saying of S. Gregory himself:² but the chief defect in Augustine's character is a certain monkish narrow-mindedness very different from the wise and discriminating breadth of view of the great Christian Bishop who had sent him forth. The three chief subjects of contention concerned the time of keeping Easter,³ the administration of Holy Baptism,⁴ and the mode of the clerical tonsure.⁵ After considerable hesitation and two conferences, the British Bishops

¹ Austcliff, on the Severn, does not suit the geographical indications given by Bede.

² Ep. i. 43, quoted by Canon Bright.

³ The Churches of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland (i.) used a method of calculating the Easter season by a cycle of eighty-four years, which had for more than a century been superseded in the Church of Rome, and (ii.) allowed Easter to fall as early as the 14th day of the Paschal moon, if that happened to be a Sunday; whereas the Nicene Council had decided that it must never be earlier than the 15th (to prevent coincidence with the Jewish Passover) so that, when the 14th was a Sunday, Easter had to be held on the Sunday following, the 21st, and was so held, except by the British Churches. (This was essentially different from the Quartodeciman usage in the early Church. The Quartodecimans, pleading the practice of S. John, always kept the Christian Pasch on the 14th, regardless of the day of the week. The British Churches kept to Sunday, and only celebrated the Pasch on the 14th, when that fell on Sunday.)

⁴ In what way their ritual fell short (Bede, ii. 2) of the Roman is unknown. The suggestion that they did not practise trine immersion, or did not use the chrism after Baptism, is unlikely, as we know that both were in use in the Irish Church.

⁵ The Roman tonsure was coronal, to imitate the Crown of thorns: that of the British was crescent, from ear to ear in front. See especially Bede, v. 21.

refused to give up their own customs, and definitely rejected Augustine's overtures, to his bitter disappointment, on account of his haughty conduct. The British and Irish Churches continued in tenacious observance of their own customs, which were only very gradually laid aside centuries afterwards.¹

§ 32. Bishops of London and Rochester. Christianity in East Anglia.—The King of Essex, Sabert, was Ethelbert's nephew, and in A.D. 604 Augustine consecrated Mellitus Bishop of London (Sabert's capital), and thus revived that very ancient see (§ 12). S. Paul's Cathedral, on the same site as the present one, was now first built by these two kings.² And it is King Sabert who is said also (though Bede does not mention this) to have founded the "West Minster," dedicated to S. Peter, on what was then a desolate swamp covered with dense thickets (*Thorn-ey*, i.e. "Thorn Island"), the site of the present Abbey (see § 95), in which King Sabert's tomb is still shown. In this same year (604) Justus was consecrated first Bishop of Rochester (probably then a little sub-kingdom of Kent), and his Cathedral church was dedicated to S. Andrew, the patron saint of the Benedictine monastery at Rome from which Augustine had so recently come.³ The King of East Anglia, Redwald, was baptized at Canterbury: but by a very curious attempt at compromise, he had a Christian and a heathen altar in the same temple; and it was probably owing to this lukewarmness that no East Anglian Bishopric was founded.

§ 33. Death of S. Augustine and of King Ethelbert. Heathen Relapse.—Thus, before S. Augustine's death in A.D. 604 or 605, he saw the spread of Christianity from Kent not only to Essex and its capital, London, but

¹ See Canon Bright, "Early Eng. Ch. Hist." pp. 431, 432, and notes.

² "In civitate Lundonia ecclesiam sancti Pauli Apostoli"—*BEDE*, ii. 3. It is said to have taken the place of an idolatrous temple of Diana on the same spot.

³ For S. Benedict of Nursia, the founder of the Benedictine Order, see Appendix P, p. 358.

partially also into Suffolk and Norfolk. But, alas, only twelve years later, when Ethelbert and Sabert were dead, their subjects threw off Christianity. London drove out its Bishop ; and all the country went back to heathenism. Even Kent was with the very greatest difficulty saved to the Faith, the despairing flight of the Bishops to France being only arrested by a vivid dream of Archbishop Laurentius (the successor of S. Augustine) on the very eve of his departure, in which he felt himself severely scourged for his cowardice by S. Peter.¹ Hereupon followed the conversion and baptism of Eadbald, Ethelbert's son and successor in Kent (A.D. 616).

§ 34. Paulinus in Northumbria. King Edwin.
Battle of Heathfield.—Nine more years went by. Laurentius, who had made a second vain appeal to the British and Irish Churches,² was succeeded at Canterbury by Mellitus in A.D. 619, and he by Justus in 624. And then an opportunity offered for a fresh mission effort. A Kentish princess, Eadbald's sister, Ethelburga, the "Darling" (Tatta), went North in A.D. 625 to be the bride of the powerful King of Northumbria, Edwin, the founder of "Edwin's burgh," or Edinburgh ; and Paulinus, one of the second staff of missionaries from Rome (§ 29) was consecrated and sent with her by Justus as Bishop to convert the Northern realm, the very district from which had come the little slave boys seen by S. Gregory at Rome (§ 26). After long and grave deliberation,³ King Edwin was baptized at York with many of the nobles of

¹ Compare the similar dream of S. Jerome, in which he seemed to undergo, before the judgment seat of Christ, a scourging by angels for his heathen studies, and which he himself related to Eustochium. So also Natalius (Euseb. "Hist. Ecc." v. 28) ; and the case cited by Tertullian ("Idol." xv. p. 170) : "Scio fratrem per visionem eadem nocte castigatum graviter."

² See Bede, ii. 4.

³ See the whole beautiful story in Bede, ii. 9, 12-14, including the episode in Edwin's early life, and the famous apologue of the sparrow

his Court (Easter Eve, A.D. 627), and there S. Peter's Church was built, on the spot where now stands the glorious minster, the pride of York. For six years the King and the Bishop laboured strenuously to spread the Christian faith, and Paulinus even received from Rome the pall (§ 29) as Archbishop of the North.¹ But then came a sudden and fearful disaster. Penda, the heathen King of Mercia (Central England) joined hands with Cadwallon, the Christian British King of North Wales, against Edwin, and slew him in a great battle at Heathfield (Hatfield, near Doncaster) in A.D. 633; and with Edwin fell for a time all hope of Christianity, for his successors apostatized from the Faith. Thoroughly disheartened, Paulinus gave up his work, fled back to Kent with the widowed Queen,² and became Bishop of Rochester till his death in A.D. 643. Northumbria was left to relapse into its former heathenism, except where one heroic worker, James the Deacon, remained to tend the dying embers of the Faith.

§ 35. *Failures of the Roman Mission.*—Truly a fatality seemed to accompany every effort of the Roman missionaries at Canterbury. Whatever they attempted, whether in Essex and London, or East Anglia, or Northumbria, failure seemed to follow all their efforts. It was by other hands, and from quite a different source, that God purposed to convert the great mass of our forefathers.

§ 36. *The Keltic Mission from Iona. S. Aidan.*—At the end of the "Hateful Year"³ of apostasy and anarchy in Northumbria a nephew of Edwin, Oswald,

fitting through the lighted and warmed hall, and out again into the wintry night, as a simile of man's life, which was uttered by one of the English nobles at the Council of Godmundingham (Goodmanham).

¹ In A.D. 628 Paulinus had consecrated Honorius to Canterbury at a church in Lincoln, Justus having recently died.

² Her little daughter, Eanfleda, then seven years old, returned to Northumbria seventeen years later as the wife of King Oswy (p. 38, n. 2).

³ "Annus detestabilis" or "infaustus" (see Bede, iii. 1, 9).

overthrew and slew the British King at Heavenfield, near Hexham (A.D. 634). Oswald had embraced Christianity in Scotland, which had been for seventeen years his home in exile ; and from Iona (§ 24), at his earnest request for a Bishop, was now sent to him the good and gentle S. Aidan. He settled, not, as Paulinus had done, at York, but at Lindisfarne, the half-insular position of which reminded him of his beloved Iona, and which remained an episcopal seat for the next two hundred and forty years. It is still known as *Holy Island*. From Lindisfarne as a starting-point were carried on those great missionary labours which by God's blessing gradually won the land to Christ. Churches began to spring up throughout Northumbria, and monasteries ; and, above all, S. Aidan established a school to train twelve English boys for future mission work among their own countrymen. Among these English lads were Chad, afterwards the saintly Bishop of Lichfield (§ 47), and Eata, S. Cuthbert's gentle Abbot at Melrose and afterwards Bishop of Hexham.

§ 37. *Christianity in East Anglia. Bishop Felix and the Irish Saint Fursey.*—Twice already had the Gospel been planted in East Anglia—once from Canterbury (§ 32) and once from Northumbria¹—and twice it had been rejected. But in A.D. 636² Felix, a Burgundian Bishop whose heart had been moved to aid in preaching to the English, arrived at Canterbury, and, following the suggestion of Archbishop Honorius, became the “Apostle of East Anglia.” Welcomed cordially by the new King, Sigebert the Learned, who had already embraced Christianity during his exile abroad in Gaul, Felix fixed his see at Dunwich, in Suffolk, a place which has now long been submerged under the sea. He received important help from a great Irish teacher,

¹ King Eorpwald had received baptism at Edwin's persuasion in A.D. 632, but was murdered the same year by one of his heathen nobles.

² There is some uncertainty about this date, and some place the coming of Felix as early as 631.

Fursey, with his two brothers and two other Irish monks—the first recorded instance of harmonious co-operation with the Keltic Church. Thus Christianity at last took firm root in East Anglia. Monasteries sprang up; and a grammar school was founded, on the model of the one at Canterbury, to train young English natives as missionaries. Cambridge, now the famous University, traditionally claims to be the site of this old East Anglian school.

§ 38. *Christianity in Wessex. Bishop Birinus.*—In the year of Oswald's victory at Heavenfield, Birinus, a missionary Bishop sent from Rome and consecrated at Genoa, had landed in Wessex. His hands were strengthened by a visit from the Christian King Oswald to the King of Wessex, Kynegils, who was baptized at Dorchester,¹ near Oxford, and whose daughter Oswald then married. The two Kings founded and endowed at Dorchester a see, which in later times, after the Norman Conquest, was transferred to Lincoln (§ 103). We hear of churches erected, and of numerous Wessex converts. The King's son and successor, Kenwalch, was a heathen: but during an exile of three years at King Anna's Court in East Anglia he became a Christian; and by him (A.D. 648) was built at Winchester, the capital of Wessex, a church, the predecessor of the present Cathedral, on the site of an old Christian church traditionally built in far-distant British times by King Lucius (§ 8).

§ 39. *King Oswy. Christianity in the Midlands and in Essex.*—In A.D. 642 the sweet-natured and heroic Royal saint, Oswald,² was slain, like Edwin nine years before

¹ “The venerable abbey church . . . now occupies the traditional spot that witnessed the Christianizing of the dynasty which grew into the royal line of England.”—CANON BRIGHT, *Early Eng. Ch. Hist.*, p. 153.

² “In reading of him we think instinctively of Alfred. Strength and sweetness were united in a character which almost represents the ideal of Christian royalty.”—*Op. cit.*, p. 139. King Oswald's dying prayer for his slaughtered army passed into an English proverb: “God have mercy on the souls, said Oswald as he fell to earth.”—BEDE, iii. 12, iv. 14.

him, in battle with Penda, the heathen King of Mercia. The fatal conflict took place at Maserfield, which is probably to be identified with Oswestry, *i.e.* Oswald's tree, near Shrewsbury. He was succeeded in the throne of Northumbria by his brother Oswy. This King foully murdered his gentle and holy kinsman, Oswin, King of Deira (A.D. 651), a murder which broke S. Aidan's heart, and brought Oswy himself much bitter remorse in after days. In A.D. 653 King Penda's own son, Peada, governor of the Mid-English under his father, was converted, and the King of Essex also, Sigeberht the Good, at the Northumbrian Court; and both were baptized by Finan, S. Aidan's successor at Lindisfarne. Of the missionaries sent to labour in their dominions, one, Diuma, became in A.D. 656 the first Bishop of Mercia; and another, Cedd, elder brother of S. Chad, was, in A.D. 654, consecrated by Finan, Bishop of the East Saxons, thirty-seven years after London had driven out its former Bishop, Mellitus.¹

§ 40. *Fall of Penda. Final triumph of Christianity.*—Meanwhile, in A.D. 653, Anna, King of East Anglia and father of the famous S. Etheldreda of Ely (§ 52), fell, as his two predecessors also had fallen, before the dreaded Mercian King. But this was Penda's last triumph: his own hour was now at hand. King Oswy of Northumbria, whom he had wantonly attacked, courageously withheld, defeated, and slew, A.D. 655, at Winwidfield (near Leeds), the aged champion of heathenism, who had destroyed no less than five Christian Kings. From the moment of Penda's death, Christianity swept irresistibly over the whole country.

§ 41. *The Conversion of the English. Summary.*—We have now traced in some detail the process of the conversion of our heathen forefathers. Not only the vast region of Northumbria (which then included also

¹ In consequence of the plague ten years later (§ 44), there was a pathetic partial relapse into heathenism (Bede, iii. 30).

Durham and Yorkshire), but the whole of Central England and Essex, with London itself, had finally received Christianity, not from the Roman mission at Canterbury, but from the North, from the settlement at Lindisfarne ("Holy Island") of the missionaries from Iona, itself an offshoot of the Keltic Churches of Ireland and Wales (see §§ 18, 22-24). The region of Norfolk and Suffolk had been converted by a French Bishop, Felix, at the head of a fresh mission, and with the important aid of missionaries from Ireland (§ 37). Wessex (the part of England stretching between Surrey and Cornwall) had been converted by another missionary Bishop from abroad, Birinus, with aid received from Northumbria. Kent, and Kent alone, was the abiding fruit of S. Augustine's mission (§ 35). Yet, while we avoid the exaggerated estimate of the work of this Roman mission which has sometimes prevailed, it must never be forgotten that we owe a very heavy debt of gratitude to this devoted band of pioneers from Rome,¹ who so boldly initiated the momentous task which they had finally to leave for others to carry to completion—the Conversion of the English race to Christ.

¹ For S. Gregory also, the great Roman Bishop (A.D. 590-604) who sent them forth (§ 26), the Church of England has always cherished a deep reverence and affection. "We do," says Archbishop Bramhall, "*with all thankfulness to God, and honourable respect to his memory, acknowledge that that blessed Saint was the chief instrument, under God, to hold forth the first light of saving truth to the English nation.*"—("Works," vol. i., p. 266, quoted by Professor Collins.) So Bede (ii. 1) calls "Pope Gregory" our "Apostle," applying to him the words of 1 Cor. ix. 2. He is commemorated on his death-day, March 12th (Appendix P, p. 358). On the subsequent relations between England and Rome, see below, §§ 60, 63, 113, 114. We may note here that the title of Pope (Lat. *Papa*, i.e. Father), which was originally a general designation of the clergy (as the word still is in the East), became restricted to the Bishop of Rome by Latin writers from about the beginning of the sixth century.

CHAPTER III

ORGANIZATION OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH

"I die in the faith of the Catholic Church, before the disunion of East and West."—BISHOP KEN.

"Theodorus, natus Tarso Ciliciæ, vir et sacerdotali et divina litteratura et Græce instructus et Latine, probus moribus et ætate venerandus."—BEDE, iv. i.

§ 42. *Rise of Mohammedanism.*—In the first half of the seventh century, the important and busy half-century during which the evangelization of England was being successfully carried out (see last chapter), the Church abroad had been startled by the rise and rapid progress of *Mohammedanism*, a new religion which for a time threatened to sweep all before it by the sword of fierce fanaticism. Three years before the marriage of Ethelburga of Kent to Edwin of Northumbria (§ 34) the Flight of Mohammed from Mecca took place, the event from which the Mohammedans date their era of the Hegira.¹ Ten years later the terrible "Saracens," his Arab converts from idolatry, burst in an irresistible torrent of frenzied religious zeal upon the world. Persia and the remoter East to the borders of China and of India; Syria, Jerusalem itself (A.D. 637), and all Asia Minor; Alexandria and Egypt, and all North Africa, fell rapidly before them. Soon they were to besiege Constantinople itself for seven successive years (A.D. 668-75). In the next century they crossed

¹ The era itself, instituted by Omar, the second Caliph, commences sixty-eight days after the actual flight, and coincides with Friday, July 16th, A.D. 622.

from Africa into Spain (A.D. 711);¹ from Spain into France (A.D. 718); and were finally driven back by the sword of Charles Martel at the famous battle of Tours (A.D. 732), which lasted a week, and literally rescued Western Christianity from the yoke of the Mohammedans, who then retired again into Spain. From the awful blow of Saracenic conquest the Church of the East has never fully recovered: the great Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and very many Bishoprics, were either swept away by the intruders altogether, or sank into comparative insignificance and lost their weight in the Councils of Christendom (see also below, § 188). Mohammedanism, still the professed religion of millions of the human race, is essentially a debased and heretical form of Christianity.² In its stern recall to monotheism³ lay its strength: in its appeal to the lower and baser passions of humanity lay the seeds of its ultimate decay as a religious system.

§ 43. The Missions in England. Need of Consolidation.—All the English kingdoms, except Sussex (see below, § 52), had now accepted Christianity; and each had its own Bishop and its own mission settlement, the centre from which itinerant preachers went

¹ The name Gibraltar, *i.e.* Jebel-al-Tarik, the “Mount of Tarik,” still commemorates the name of the Arab general who first crossed the straits.

² Arabia had long been a place of refuge for Sabians and Magians, Jews, and various heretical sects of Christians. These religions, disseminated from the Persian Gulf to the Red Sea, had great influence on the Arab idolaters (Gibbon, vol. vi., pp. 214-216), and also on the strange amalgam produced by Mohammed. “Mahometanism must be regarded as an eccentric heretical form of Eastern Christianity. This, in fact, was the ancient mode of regarding Mahomet. He was considered, not in the light of the founder of a new religion, but rather as one of the chief heresiarchs of the Church.”—DEAN STANLEY, *Eastern Church*, p. 260.

³ “The Christians of the seventh century had insensibly relapsed into a semblance of paganism. Their public and private vows were addressed to the relics and images that disgraced the temples of the East. The throne of the Almighty was darkened by a cloud of martyrs and saints and angels, the objects of popular veneration. And the Collyridian heretics, who flourished in the fruitful soil of Arabia, invested the Virgin Mary with the name and honours of a goddess.”—GIBBON.

ceaselessly forth to town and hamlet, proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation at the simple wayside Cross, till permanent churches came into existence. It remained to consolidate the scattered Christian settlements into one great Native Church, embracing the whole nation ; it was time to "arise and build" the outward framework of that national religious organization which we call the CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

§ 44. Council of Whitby. The Choice of Theodore.—The times were ripe for union. In A.D. 664 was held the Council of Whitby,¹ convened and presided over by King Oswy (§ 39) in person, at which, mainly under the influence of the young and brilliant Wilfrith or Wilfrid, Abbot of Ripon,² it was formally decided to abandon throughout Northumbria the old British usages which formed so insuperable a bar to union and concord (§ 31). Three years later King Oswy, in conjunction with the King of Kent, Egbert, and the whole Church of England,³ selected a clergyman of Kent, named Wighard, for the vacant Primacy, and sent him to Rome for consecration. The reason for this unusual step was the failure of the episcopal succession from S. Augustine, Wini, Bishop of Winchester,⁴ being now the only surviving representative of that succession ; for the Bishops of Rochester, Lindisfarne, and London, as well as the Archbishop of Canterbury,

¹ Or, rather, Streonaeshalch. The name Whitby, *i.e.* "White Town," was given to this place long afterwards by the Danes.

² Wilfrid had recently returned, full of enthusiasm, from a visit to Canterbury and Rome. He was supported at the Council by Bishop Agilbert (§ 46) and James the Deacon (§ 34, end), with the Queen of Northumbria, Eanfleda (from Kent), and her son Alchfrid, Wilfrid's bosom friend. On the other side, for the Scottish usages, were Bishop Colman, the successor of Finan (§ 39) at Lindisfarne, Bishop Cedd (§ 39), and Edwin's grandniece, the famous Abbess of Whitby, S. Hilda. Rather than accept the Roman usages Colman afterwards, with many of his monks, withdrew to Iona, and finally to Ireland.

³ "Cum electione et consensu sanctæ Ecclesiæ gentis Anglorum."—*BEDE*, iii. 29.

⁴ The see of Winchester had been formed by King Kenwalch in A.D. 660, by a division of the huge diocese of Dorchester. Compare § 38.

Deusdedit, himself,¹ had been swept away in A.D. 664 by the Yellow Pest. Wighard, however, fell ill and died at Rome : and the Pope thereupon sent word to the English Kings that he would endeavour, "according to the tenor of their writings,"² to find a suitable man for the vacancy. He offered it to the Abbot of a monastery near Naples, Adrian, a monk of African birth and great learning ; but he, with some difficulty, induced the Pope to nominate his friend Theodore instead. Theodore, though a monk, was still a layman, and had also received the *Greek* tonsure ; there was therefore a delay of some months till he had gone through the different orders of the ministry, and the growth of his hair permitted the Roman tonsure.³ He was consecrated Archbishop in A.D. 668 ; and, after weary delays, reached England in May of the following year, accompanied by the famous Northumbrian, Benedict Biscop (§ 48).

§ 45. *Caedmon. S. Cuthbert.*—Shortly before the Council of Whitby Caedmon, an elderly herdsman attached to S. Hilda's great monastery there, astonished everyone by his sudden gift of sacred song, by which he threw open to the common people in their own tongue the treasures of the Bible and the Christian Creed, and became the "father of English poetry." Shortly after the same Council⁴ S. Cuthbert first came into notice as Prior of Lindisfarne. This great Northumbrian saint, the "Apostle of the Lowlands," was a shepherd lad whose longings for a religious life had driven him in A.D. 651, just after S. Aidan's death (§ 39), to the monastery of Melrose. He did magnificent work among the rough Northumbrian peasantry, whose hearts were reached and won by words from the lips of a preacher who was one of themselves in birth and

¹ The first Archbishop of native birth. His real name was Frithona.

² "Secundum vestrorum scriptorum tenorem."—BEDE, *l.c.*

³ See p. 28, n. 5. The Greeks shaved the whole head.

⁴ The chronology of this part of S. Cuthbert's life is, however, somewhat uncertain.

breeding. And now, transferred to Lindisfarne, in the crisis that followed the departure of Colman and his monks (p. 38, n. 2), he was able as prior, by the exercise of his indomitable patience and gentleness, to reconcile the stubborn remnant there to the new usages, and to new rules of stricter discipline which he himself drew up. (See also below, § 58.)

§ 46. *Wilfrid, Bishop of York.*—On the speedy death of Bishop Colman's successor, Tuda, at Lindisfarne (§ 44), Wilfrid had been nominated to the Bishopric of Northumbria, and obtained the removal of the see back from Lindisfarne (§ 36) to its original city, York (§§ 12, 34). Wilfrid, in the vacancy of the Archbishopric, went to Gaul for his consecration, which took place with the utmost splendour at Compiègne; among the consecrators was Agilbert, who had been for a time Bishop of Dorchester in succession to Birinus (§ 38), and had been present in Wilfrid's support at the momentous Council of Whitby (p. 38, n. 2).¹ But the new Bishop of York remained abroad so many months that the English King lost patience, and supplied his place with Ceadda (S. Chad), one of S. Aidan's former pupils (§ 36) and Abbot of Lastingham, who was consecrated by Bishop Wini of Winchester and two *British* Bishops.² Wilfrid retired quietly to his monastery of Ripon, performing occasional episcopal acts in Mercia and Kent, and awaiting the arrival of the anxiously expected Archbishop from Rome.

§ 47. *Archbishop Theodore. S. Chad.*—And now at length landed in England that great Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore, whose glory it is to have achieved the work of union and consolidation, for which everything was now ready.

Theodore was, like S. Paul (Acts, xxi. 39), of

¹ Agilbert shortly afterwards became Bishop of Paris.

² Thus the Roman and Keltic lines of episcopal succession met in S. Chad. On Theodore's "completion" of his consecration, see Canon Bright, "Early Eng. Ch. Hist." p. 237.

Tarsus in Cilicia ; and, as we have seen, he was specially selected and consecrated to the Primacy by the Pope, Vitalian, at the request of the English Kings (§ 44). Though already an old man of sixty-six, he at once threw himself with wonderful energy into his new sphere of labour. Hitherto the Archbishops had been little known beyond their own diocese of Kent, and Canterbury was in very great danger of being completely overshadowed and eclipsed by the vast Northumbrian diocese of York, which included the whole of England north of the Humber, as well as that part of Scotland which was subject to King Oswy.¹ Theodore as soon as possible began a great tour of visitation through all the English kingdoms, arranging and setting right what he found amiss, and received everywhere with the greatest loyalty and enthusiasm.² Wilfrid he at once replaced at York ; and for S. Chad, the intruded Bishop (§ 46), whose gentleness and humility had won his profound respect,³ he obtained shortly afterwards the bishopric of Mercia (Lichfield). S. Chad, "one of the truest and purest saints of ancient England," is commemorated on March 2nd, the day of his death three years later.⁴

§ 48. *Wilfrid at York. Benedict Biscop.*—Wilfrid, thus at length in possession of his canonical rights, displayed the most intense vigour and earnestness throughout his immense diocese, building great churches (those at Ripon and Hexham were particularly celebrated for their magnificence), regulating monasteries, and improving the Church services with the indefatigable aid of his friend, Benedict Biscop. The latter was, like Wilfrid himself, a young

¹ Bede, iv. 3.

² "Libentissime ab omnibus suscipiebatur atque audiebatur. . . . Isque primus erat in archiepiscopis cui omnis Anglorum ecclesia manus dare consentiret."—BEDE, iv. 2.

³ These were exactly the qualities in which Theodore seems to have been himself most deficient. See below.

⁴ Appendix P, p. 358.

Northumbrian of noble birth who had become a monk; and he made in the course of his life no less than six journeys to distant Rome, bringing back costly books and pictures, vestments, and relics, as well as the precentor of S. Peter's, John the Chanter himself, for the two great Benedictine monasteries founded by him at Wearmouth (A.D. 674) and Jarrow (A.D. 680), the latter famous for all time as the lifelong residence of Bede (§ 68). This was the brightest and most brilliant period in Wilfrid's chequered career; in A.D. 672 the Queen of Northumbria, S. Etheldreda, herself received the veil from his hands at Coldingham (§ 52).

§ 49. *Synod of Hertford. Ecclesiastical Unity.*—In A.D. 673 Theodore gathered the English Bishops together (Wilfrid appeared by his legates only) in a synod at Hertford, where nine canons,¹ dealing with the date of Easter, the relations between Bishops, monasteries, and clergy, the establishment of a yearly synod at Clofesho,² and the marriage laws, were subscribed by the assembled Episcopate: and thus the foundation of discipline in the English Church was laid. By her regular clerical assemblies, of which the Pan-Anglican Synod of Hertford was the first, the Church gave to the disunited and quarrelling English tribes (§ 64) a valuable object lesson in unity, and gradually taught them all to unite into one great state, ENGLAND (§ 60). But that was not to be for many a long day yet. All early English history shows us that, so far from the State having established the Church, the converse is rather true; it was the *Church* that *established the State*.

§ 50. “*Imperial Federation.*”—History repeats itself: and the Pan-Anglican Synods of the English Church, held every ten years, in which her Bishops from all

¹ Of the *ten* canons laid by Theodore before the synod, one providing for the gradual subdivision of the dioceses was, for the time, put aside. Compare below, §§ 52, 55.

² Cliff-at-Hoe, five miles from Rochester.

parts of the world meet together in council, are helping to familiarize the English race with that idea of *Imperial Federation* which will, in all human probability, before many years are passed, become an accomplished fact, with all its momentous consequences for England and the world.

§ 51. *Theodore and Wilfrid.*—In his endeavour to draw tight the reins of discipline, Theodore naturally met with occasional opposition. Soon after the Synod of Hertford, we find him deposing Winfrid, the successor of S. Chad at Lichfield, “for some insubordination.” In A.D. 678 he came into collision with a spirit as masterful as his own; and the long contest with Bishop Wilfrid turned on the question of the subdivision of the huge northern diocese.

§ 52. *Wilfrid's Appeal to Rome.*—In A.D. 672 Wilfrid had fallen under the displeasure of King Egfrid, Oswy's son and successor¹ in Northumbria, for the part he had played in encouraging his Queen, the famous S. Etheldreda, to abandon her husband for a monastic life.² With the King's consent and approbation, Theodore, in pursuance of his settled policy, arranged in A.D. 678 a division of the overgrown diocese of York (§ 47) into four, without obtaining, or even asking, the prior consent of Wilfrid. Against this action of the Primate, Wilfrid then *appealed to the Pope*, a novel proceeding which aroused the greatest indignation against him, and seems to have led to his immediate deposition. On his way to Rome he paused to preach to the heathen Frisians, passing through their country as the less perilous route.³ A synod of fifty Bishops was held at Rome (A.D. 679) to consider his case, and decided

¹ Oswy had died in A.D. 670 (Bede, iv. 5).

² S. Etheldreda (§ 40) took the veil at Coldingham in A.D. 672; fled the following year, in fear of her husband's pursuit, to her own domain of Ely; and there founded the great abbey which was destroyed two centuries later by the Danes (§ 80). She died there in A.D. 679. Compare Appendix P, p. 358.

³ See Canon Bright, “Early Eng. Ch. Hist.” pp. 297-299.

that he must be restored, and then himself carry out, with Theodore, the needful division in a provincial synod. But the strong dislike of *foreign interference*, characteristic of Englishmen throughout their history, was effectually roused. The King and Council repudiated the decree which he brought back from Rome, on the ground that it had been corruptly obtained, and committed Wilfrid himself to strict imprisonment for several months. On his release he took refuge first in Mercia, then in Wessex, and finally in Sussex, which, being cut off from the rest of England by a wild district of wood and marsh, the Andredswæald, was still heathen, although its King was Christian. Wilfrid became the "Apostle of Sussex": he laboured there successfully for five years (A.D. 681-6), and established at Selsey, *i.e.* "Seal Island," a monastery, and a Bishopric which after the Norman Conquest was transferred to Chichester (§ 103).

§ 53. *The Monothelite Heresy. Synod of Hatfield. Sixth General Council.*—In the East, so prolific of heresies (§ 19), there was a recrudescence in this century of the long controversy concerning the mode of the Incarnation (§ 21). Monothelitism, or the assertion that our Lord had "One Will" only, was put forward by Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in A.D. 629, under the Emperor Heraclius, and had now troubled the Church for more than half a century. The controversy was, like the earlier ones, of very great importance, because essentially involving the reality of our Lord's Humanity and of His willing self-sacrifice.¹ The Bishops of Rome, the great Apostolic see of the West, were, with one exception (see below), strong and uncompromising champions of orthodoxy,

¹ See Canon Bright, "Early Eng. Ch. Hist." pp. 229, 326; "Waymarks," pp. 401-408. If our Lord, instead of the two Wills corresponding to His two Natures, Divine and Human (§ 19), had had but *one* Will, that of His Divinity, He could not have been "perfect Man" as well as "perfect God." Compare Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." v. 48. § 9.

and thus established yet more firmly the pre-eminence which from early times had naturally accrued to them as heads of the chief city of the world,¹ where also lay buried the great Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul. Pope Martin I., for resolutely maintaining, with his Roman synod (A.D. 649), the "Two Wills in the one Christ, corresponding to His Two Natures . . . suffered in that cause the most brutal injustice, ending in exile and death,"² at the hands of the Emperor Constans II. (A.D. 653-5). At length the Emperor Constantine IV. convened the Sixth General Council at Constantinople: and it was on the eve of this expected Council that Archbishop Theodore in far-distant Britain assembled the second formal synod of the English Church, which at Hatfield (A.D. 680) ratified and accepted the decisions of the Five General Councils already held, and approved the decrees of the recent synod of Pope Agatho (which Wilfrid, then at Rome for his appeal, had officially attended) in condemnation of Monothelitism. By the Sixth General Council, held at Constantinople under the Emperor's auspices in A.D. 680-1, this "subtle variety of Eutychianism" was finally condemned.³ The decrees of this General Council anathematize by name, among others, one of the Popes, Honorius I. (A.D. 625-40), for his acceptance of the Monothelite heresy; and for the next three hundred years every Pope at his accession solemnly repeated the stern condemnation of his erring predecessor.⁴

§ 54. The General Councils.—We have now very

¹ See above, p. 14 and n. 1, and compare Irenæus, "Hær." iii. 3. § 2. See Dr. Gibson, "Thirty-Nine Art." p. 777 and n.

² Canon Bright, *l.c.*, p. 229.

³ It only survived in an obscure sect, the Maronites of Mount Lebanon.

⁴ The present Romanist dogma of Papal Infallibility (made an article of faith as late as A.D. 1870) finds no countenance in the early Church or in the pages of history, and one of the Popes, Adrian VI., in A.D. 1522, expressly repudiated the idea (below, p. 171, n. 2). Pope Liberius, in the fourth century, accepted an Arian creed; Pope Zosimus in the fifth vindicated Pelagius (see § 17); Pope Vigilius in the

briefly traced the way in which the Church was guided (S. John, xvi. 13) to define and safeguard the momentous truths of the MOST HOLY TRINITY and the INCARNATION, on which all else ultimately depends.¹ In the first Six General Councils all possible forms of error regarding these vital doctrines of Christianity were successively confronted and repelled by the Undivided Church. The last Council which has any real claim to the title "General," the seventh, was held a century later by the Empress Irene (A.D. 787), was occupied with a wholly different controversy, and failed to obtain the same universal acceptance (§§ 75, 76). Since then the disunion of Christendom, and in particular the great sundering of East and West, due primarily to the ever-growing ambition and arrogance of the Church of Rome (below, § 97), have rendered impossible for the present the assemblage of a genuine General Council of the Church Universal, as in the olden days.²

§ 55. Theodore and the English Church. Division of Dioceses.—Union is strength; and the English Church, under the skilful guidance of Archbishop Theodore,

sixth was condemned for misbelief by the Fifth General Council; Pope Honorius in the seventh, as we have just seen, accepted the Monothelite heresy. As the Encyclical of the Eastern Bishops in 1895 reminds us, "The apostle Peter himself, whose successor the Pope supposes himself to be, thrice denied the Lord, and was . . . rebuked by the apostle Paul as not walking aright in respect of the truth of the Gospel (Gal. ii. 11)." See also Canon Bright, "Waymarks," pp. 206-241, 404-407.

¹ See S. Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; S. Matt. xvi. 16-19. We show our belief in the former by an act of reverence at every mention of the Thrice-Holy in Divine service (Is. vi. 2, 3), and our belief in the latter by the lowered tone and reverent gesture with which we repeat in the Nicene Creed the solemn words "*came down from heaven, And was INCARNATE by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, And was made man.*" Compare Ps. ii. 11, xcvi. 6.

² Such a Council may be expected to meet again some day, when God has brought us together again; and to it the Church of England looks forward for the settlement of her own long controversy with the Pope. On General Councils, see Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." i. 10. § 14; iv. 13. § 8; v. 54. § 10; and compare Art. xxi. at end of our Prayer-Book, and Dr. Gibson, *in loc.* See also below, §§ 169, 322.

rapidly grew and flourished. He increased the number of Bishops, breaking up the larger dioceses (co-extensive with whole kingdoms) into smaller and more manageable ones, which have lasted, with some few changes and additions, for *twelve hundred years*, down to our own time. East Anglia he divided into two (A.D. 673) by a new see at Elmham, which, after the Conquest, was transferred to Thetford, and finally to Norwich in A.D. 1094 (§ 103). Northumbria he divided, as we have seen, into four dioceses, York, Lindisfarne, Hexham, and Lindsey; and in A.D. 679 he divided the huge Mercian diocese into five, Lichfield, Hereford, Worcester, Leicester, and Lindsey, the latter (S. Lincolnshire) having just been recovered from Northumbria by Mercia. In each case he followed the lines of early tribal divisions. Shortly after his death, when Wessex also had been subdivided by a new see at Sherborne (§ 67), the whole nation consisted of sixteen dioceses, all subject to the Metropolitan at Canterbury.

§ 56. *Theodore and the School at Canterbury.*—Theodore himself was a Greek, and brought the knowledge of his native tongue to England. The school at Canterbury (§ 37) was deeply indebted to his own wide learning, which gained him the name of "the Philosopher," and to that of his friend Adrian (§ 44) who followed him to England, and who, as Abbot of the monastery at Canterbury, took the school there under his special charge. The famous S. John of Beverley (§ 68), and Aldhelm (§ 67), and many another were trained at this great school, the prototype of the yet greater one at York (§ 70).¹

§ 57. *The Parochial System. Church Endowments.*—Nor did Theodore's services to the Church of England end here. To him is traced back the first introduction of the Parochial System, which has covered the land

¹ Canon Bright, "Early Eng. Ch. Hist." pp. 246, 247. See also Bede, iv. 1, 2.

by degrees with a network of parishes, each with its resident clergyman.¹ The boundaries of the parishes coincided with those of the already existing townships, the ecclesiastical parish being merely the township, or cluster of townships, to which a single priest was appointed to minister.² Churches were now built in all directions, landowners voluntarily giving up for God's perpetual service the sites and endowments which the enemies of the Church, some from ignorance, some from malice, actually declare to be the property of the State, and given by it! The idea, like all erroneous ideas, dies hard ; but die it must in the clear light of history. The Church's property was given to the Church, not to the State, which as yet did not even exist.

§ 58. Death of S. Cuthbert. Recall of Wilfrid to York.—S. Cuthbert (§ 45) had for eight years buried himself in a secluded hermit life on one of the rocky Farne islets, when, in A.D. 685, he reluctantly accepted the Bishopric of Lindisfarne, and was consecrated by Theodore at York. Two years later this renowned Northumbrian saint passed to his rest (A.D. 687). Meanwhile, King Egfrid fell in battle with the Picts ; and his successor, Aldfrid the Wise, the “first of our literary Kings,” consented in the following year through the good offices of Theodore, to recall (A.D. 686) Wilfrid from his exile to York.

§ 59. Death of Theodore. Second Expulsion of Wilfrid.—In A.D. 690 died Archbishop Theodore, full of years and honours. Shortly afterwards ecclesiastical discord broke out anew in Northumbria, and Bishop Wilfrid, for obstinately refusing the proposed creation of the see of Ripon, was a second time expelled from York. He found refuge now in the rival kingdom of

¹ See Appendix C, The Parochial System.

² The local divisions into townships were of the greatest antiquity, the system having been brought by our ancestors from their German home. See Bishop Stubbs, “*Const. Hist.*” vol. i., pp. 71, 82, 85, 227 [Clarendon Press Series].

Mercia, and became Bishop of Leicester (§ 55) for ten years.

§ 60. *Summary. England and Rome.*—The masterful rule of Theodore had brought to English Christianity, as yet weak and disorganized, the priceless gift of organized unity, welding together the independent mission settlements into the one National Church, more than a century and a half before the warring English tribes attained to union in the one State. “The regular subordination of priest to bishop, of bishop to primate, in the administration of the Church supplied a mould on which the civil organization of the state quietly shaped itself.”¹ The attitude of the English Church to that of Rome was, naturally, one of deep respect, gratitude, and deference, but not one of subjugation. We have seen the Papal decree in Wilfrid’s favour unceremoniously set aside by an English King and his Council of Bishops and Nobles, and the audacious appellant imprisoned (§ 52). And our English independence of outside ecclesiastical interference was in the end so completely vindicated that no other instance of the kind occurs for nearly *four hundred years*,² down to the very eve of the Norman Conquest. We shall have occasion again and again in the course of these pages to point out the fallacy of the idea that the Church of England was *Roman Catholic* till the Reformation. She was, and is, English to the core.

¹ J. R. Green, “Short History of the English People,” p. 32. He adds, “It was the ecclesiastical synods which by their example led the way to our national parliament, as it was the canons enacted in such synods which led the way to a national system of law.” Compare above, §§ 49, 50.

² Compare Bishop Stubbs, *op. cit.*, vol. iii., pp. 348-349.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTH CENTURY

“Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers.”—*Isaiah*, xl ix. 23.

“Our estate is according to the pattern of God’s own ancient elect people, which people was not part of them the commonwealth and part of them the Church of God, but the selfsame people whole and entire were both under one chief governor, on whose supreme authority they did all depend.”—HOOKER, *Ecc. Pol.* viii. 1. § 7.

§ 61. Wilfrid’s second appeal to Rome. His partial restoration and death.—At the opening of the eighth century there still remained an obstacle to the deepening current of Church life in the long-standing controversy with Wilfrid. The synod of Easterfield (probably Austerfield, in Yorkshire) was convened by King Aldfrid in A.D. 702, but entirely failed to settle the matter, though it was attended by Theodore’s successor, Archbishop Brihtwald or Bertwald, with nearly all the English Bishops. Wilfrid proved unyielding as ever; and, after high words had passed, he appealed once more to the Pope. Once more he started in person for Rome, visiting Frisia on the way (compare § 52), where Willibrord (§ 69) was now carrying on his mission work. Once more a Roman synod examined into his case: and again he brought back a Papal rescript in his favour. To the messengers from Wilfrid bringing this document King Aldfrid, with the advice of his Council, made a memorable reply, which reminds us of similar resolute declarations of other

English Kings long afterwards (§§ 98, 198) : “ *What my predecessors and the Archbishop, with their advisers, determined, and what I myself with the Archbishop, sent from the Apostolic see, and nearly all the Bishops of the nation have decided upon, this I am resolved never, while I live, to alter for any alleged writings from the Apostolic see.* ”¹ After the King’s death, a thoroughly English compromise was effected by Archbishop Brihtwald at the Council of the Nidd (A.D. 706). Wilfrid was not restored to York ; but he was made Bishop of Hexham, with possession of his beloved monastery at Ripon (§§ 44, 59). The intrepid old man, who had seen so many strange vicissitudes, died in A.D. 709, in his seventy-sixth year. A strong partisan of Rome throughout his life, of most brilliant talents, splendid in his tastes, but headstrong and fitter to rule than to obey, he forms one of the most remarkable and instructive figures in the early English Church.

§ 62. *S. Guthlac of Crowland.*—What S. Cuthbert had been to Northumbria (§ 58), that S. Guthlac was to Mercia. In A.D. 699 he left the monastery of Repton and became a hermit, choosing the wildest and most desolate island in the fens of Lincolnshire for his habitation. His life, but not his renown, terminated in A.D. 714. On the site of his hermitage sprang up the far-famed Abbey of Crowland.

§ 63. *National Religious Unity. Independence of Rome.*—In the century that followed the labours of Theodore the Church of England gained the grand position she has never since wholly lost. All the English were Christians ; and they worshipped and served God in the one National Church, without thought of setting up rival chapels and creeds to mar her majestic unity before God and man. Rome was then very different from the Rome of to-day ; and even

¹ Eddi, 58, quoted by Canon Bright (“ Early Eng. Ch. Hist.” p. 421), to whose well-known work these pages are very deeply indebted throughout the whole period of which he treats.

then any effort of the Pope, the foreign Bishop of Rome, to intrude into English affairs at his own will was respectfully but steadily resisted and repulsed, as it was from time to time all down our history till the Reformation itself. There is no more absurd perversion of history than the idea, which the Romanists in England sedulously try to propagate, that the Church was *Roman Catholic* till the Reformation. CATHOLIC she was always, as she is still—the branch of the Holy Catholic Church set by God in this land to teach the wild English tribes the blessings of unity, peace, and concord, and to mould them into that great religious Nation which she has since led forth to the conquest of the world.

§ 64. *Civil Disunion. The Three Kingdoms.*—During this eighth century, and beyond it, England was divided between three principal kingdoms, in the North, the Midlands, and the South—Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex—the two latter at constant enmity and warfare with one another. Wessex produced a great King, Ine or Ina (see below, § 66); then Mercia a great King, Offa (§ 72); and finally Wessex again a great King, Egbert, who at length, in A.D. 828 (§ 78), became the first sole King of the united land, “King of the English.”¹ The union of the Church under Theodore (§ 49) had preceded by a hundred and fifty years the union of the State under Egbert.

§ 65. *The Royal Supremacy. Position of Bishops and Clergy. Growth of Endowments.*—The *Royal Supremacy over the Church*, which so many people imagine to have begun with Henry VIII. at the Reformation, was fully exercised by these old English Kings. Each of them was supreme in his own kingdom over all persons and causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil. The English Bishops were constantly appointed by the Kings, usually in consultation with their Witan or

¹ “Rex Anglorum.” The title “Rex Angliæ,” King of *England*, was not in use till the reign of John.

Council,¹ just as they are appointed by the Queen in consultation with her ministers now; and then they were of course *consecrated* to their high office, then as now, by the solemn laying on of hands by other Bishops, in accordance with the invariable practice of the Catholic Church from Apostolic times (§ 5). And while the King was supreme in his kingdom,² the highest spiritual authority in the land was not the Pope³ (whose attempted interferences with the Church of England met with little success till some time after the Norman Conquest), but the Archbishop of Canterbury, who enjoyed a unique position as head of an organized system extending through the still disunited English kingdoms. The Bishops ranked with the noblest in the kingdoms, and had their seat of right in the Witan, or House of Lords, of the kingdom to which they belonged; and this is why they sat (as they still do) in the *one* House of Lords, when the kingdoms became united into one. (The House of Commons did not come into existence till far later times.) The Bishop, as well as the ealdorman, or chief governor, sat in the Shire-Moot, held twice a year, with the King's officer, the Shire-Reeve (*Sheriff*), to assist the latter in the administration of justice.⁴ And to the monthly

¹ The Witenagemot, the supreme Council of the kingdom, consisted of the King's thegns (the royal *ministri*, or personal retainers) and the chief national officers, clerical and lay, *i.e.* the ealdormen of the shires or provinces, and the Bishops of the kingdom, with occasional Abbots. It had no representative character. Its "counsel and consent" were necessary in all important business; and it was also a court of justice, though only in the last resort, or in the case of very powerful transgressors. See Bishop Stubbs, "Const. Hist." vol. i., pp. 124-140. Compare below, §§ 143, 146.

² Hence Kenulf, King of Wessex, for instance, grants in A.D. 755 by his own authority exemption from episcopal jurisdiction to the Abbey of Abingdon. King Edgar styles himself "Vicar of Christ," and Edward the Confessor is styled "Vicar of the Supreme King" in the laws called by his name.

³ No obedience to the Roman see is alluded to in the earliest pontificals (Dean Spence, "The Church of England," vol. i., p. 464). Compare below, § 71.

⁴ The actual judicial functions were discharged in the Shire-Moot

Hundred-Moot came the parson of each township (§ 57) as well as the reeve and the four representative "best men," and the lords of lands or their stewards. The clergy, being marked out by their superior education and ability as well as by their sacred functions, were looked up to by all classes alike, and their political power was very great. And all this time the work of endowment was steadily going on, just in the way that it is going on still ; not from the State, as people often fancy, but from the pious gifts of the Church's own sons, gifts for God's service, of which no one has any right whatever to deprive her now.

§ 66. *Ine of Wessex*.—Ine, the powerful King of Wessex (A.D. 688-726), is a striking typical instance of the prevailing piety and enthusiasm. We can only pause to mention briefly his written code of laws (*circa* A.D. 690), which forms an epoch in the relations between Church and State; his foundation of the Abbey of Abingdon ; his restoration and rich endowment of the ancient British Abbey of Glastonbury,¹ after his final conquest of Somerset ; and his resignation of the crown after a reign of thirty-eight years, that he might spend the rest of his life in devotional retirement. He passed his remaining days within the walls of a monastery at Rome, where he had already founded a school for the training and education of English youths.

§ 67. *S. Aldhelm*.—Archbishop Theodore, himself a Greek, had introduced into England Greek as well as Latin studies (§ 56), and before he passed away English scholars were already beginning to make Europe ring with the fame of English learning. S. Aldhelm, the renowned Abbot of Malmesbury (A.D. 675), who had himself received his education in (itself a representative body attended by not only the lords of lands but the reeve and four best men of every township) by a special body of twelve senior thegns, acting under the guidance of the sheriff (Bishop Stubbs, "Const. Hist." vol. i., p. 115).

¹ This famous shrine (see p. 10) had passed into the hands of Wessex after the victories of Kenwalch, in A.D. 658.

Adrian's school at Canterbury, attracted crowds of foreign students from France and Scotland, and became the most learned and influential man of his time.¹ He wrote ballads in the native English, and an English translation of the Psalms; to him was due Ine's foundation of Abingdon and restoration of Glastonbury; and he reluctantly consented to be the first Bishop of Ine's newly-founded see at Sherborne (A.D. 705). The "little church"² of S. Lawrence at Bradford-on-Avon still survives to testify to his skill as an architect. He died in the same year as Wilfrid and Adrian, A.D. 709.

§ 68. *The Venerable Bede.*—Second on the roll of English scholars of this century comes the Venerable Bede, the world-famous monk of Northumbria (born in A.D. 673), whose "Ecclesiastical History of the Nation of the English," written (in Latin) at the request of the Northumbrian King, has been frequently quoted above, and is indeed almost the only source of our knowledge of Church history in this land down to his own times. He spent the quiet, uneventful devotional life of a student and a recluse in his beloved monastery of Jarrow,³ where he was ordained deacon and priest by the venerated Bishop, S. John of Beverley.⁴ No less than forty-five tracts or treatises from his pen remain, a sort of encyclopædia of all the knowledge of his time. He passed peacefully away on the eve of Ascension Day, A.D. 735, living just long enough to complete his translation of S. John's Gospel. (See also p. 359.)

¹ "Vir undecumque doctissimus." "Et sermone nitidus et scripturarum . . . tam liberalium [i.e. classical] quam ecclesiasticarum erat eruditio mirandus."—BEDE, v. 18. Compare Canon Bright, "Early Eng. Ch. Hist." pp. 408-410.

² "Ecclesiola."—MALMESB. *Gest. Pont.* v. 198.

³ One of the twin monasteries founded by Benedict Biscop, and supplied by him with the treasure of a great library from Rome. See § 48.

⁴ This saintly prelate, whose reputation in the north was second only to S. Cuthbert's, had been one of S. Hilda's monks at Whitby. He became Bishop of Hexham in A.D. 687, and of York in A.D. 706.

§ 69. *Foreign Missions. Willibrord. S. Boniface.*—Strong in her unity at home, the Church of England was strong also abroad. Famous missionaries went forth from her to foreign lands. In A.D. 690, the year of Theodore's death, Willibrord, a Northumbrian educated at Wilfrid's monastery of Ripon, sailed from Ireland with twelve companions (compare § 24) to preach the Faith in Friesland. He gained the sympathy and support of Pepin, Duke of the Franks, the great-grandfather of Charlemagne (§ 74), and in A.D. 696 was consecrated Archbishop by the Pope, who changed his name to Clement. He fixed his see at Utrecht, not ending his long and eventful career till A.D. 739.¹ And the still more famous Winfrid, or Boniface, born in Devonshire about A.D. 680, was the "Apostle of Germany." After several years of successful labour among the Hessians, he was consecrated at Rome a missionary Bishop in A.D. 722; and in 732, the year of the momentous battle of Tours (see § 42), he became Archbishop. Six years later, after a visit to Rome, he proceeded to organize the Church in Bavaria; and finally, in A.D. 741, was called to reform the disorders and abuses in which the Gallican Church had been involved by Charles Martel, the victor of the Saracens. He fixed his see at Mayence (Mainz, or Mentz, on the Rhine). In his old age Boniface resumed his mission labours, and was murdered in Friesland, the scene of his early preaching, by some heathen natives on Whitsun Eve, June 5th, A.D. 755. The career of this great English missionary excited the highest admiration in the Church at home. Not only did his death-day become one of our Church Festivals,² but he was solemnly enrolled, as Archbishop Cuthbert wrote to his successor in Germany, "with Gregory and Augustine, as the three patrons of our Church in the

¹ Thus he was still alive when Bede wrote ("Hist. Ecc." v. 11, end).

² Appendix P, p. 359.

presence of Christ whom he loved in life, whom in death he magnificently glorified.”¹

§ 70. *The York Archbischopric revived.*—In the year of Bede’s death (A.D. 735), and partly owing to his counsels, the see of York became an Archbischopric, its Bishop, Egbert, receiving the pall from Rome, in accordance with the original scheme of S. Gregory (§ 30), which had been in complete abeyance ever since the flight of Paulinus (§ 34).² Egbert ruled the Northern Province for thirty-three years, and was the munificent founder of a library at York, and of an important school there, which was soon to win undying fame from its associations with the great name of Alcuin (§ 74).

§ 71. *English Independence of Rome.*—It is instructive to find S. Boniface, at the height of his fame and success (§ 69), attempting by an earnest letter to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to bring about the submission of the English Church to Rome.³ The proposal was made in the great Council at Clovesho in A.D. 747, which corrected many disorders in the Church; but the matter was significantly passed over in complete silence, and the English Church continued to maintain that national independence (§ 60) of which we shall find her so tenacious throughout her history.

§ 72. *The Lichfield Archbischopric. Council of Chelsea.*—It was not long, however, before an opportunity offered which was eagerly seized by Rome. The powerful King Offa of Mercia (A.D. 758-96) resolved that Lichfield, the see of his own kingdom, should be raised to equal rank with Canterbury and York (§ 70) as an Archbischopric: and the Pope, on his application, consented, on condition that Roman legates should be despatched to England. This was an entire innovation; and no other instance occurs before

¹ Bishop Browne’s Address at Glastonbury, August 3rd, 1896.

² Compare § 46.

³ He had himself, at his consecration at Rome, taken an oath of allegiance to the Pope.

the Norman Conquest (§ 98). The Papal legates came in A.D. 787, and presided at the Council of Chelsea (Cealchythe), where a body of canons, proposed by the legates, was adopted by the Bishops and Abbots, and by the King himself and his Nobles. They had already been laid before the Archbishop and Bishops of the Northern Province, and subscribed by them. One of the canons then passed recognized explicitly the imperative Christian duty of paying tithes.¹ Seven years after Offa's death the Lichfield Archbischopric was formally abolished.²

§ 73. *Peter's Pence.*—With Offa originated “Peter's Pence,” a yearly tax of one penny on every hearth of his dominions, primarily for the support of Ine's school at Rome (§ 66). The Pope's claim to it was allowed by William I. at the Norman Conquest (§ 98); and it was paid, with occasional interruptions, down to the Reformation.

§ 74. *Alcuin and Charlemagne.*—In or about the year of Bede's death (A.D. 735) was born the greatest Englishman of the century, Alwyn or ALCUIN, a scholar and afterwards teacher in Archbishop Egbert's school at York. In A.D. 781 he made the acquaintance of Charlemagne, the mighty King of the Franks, afterwards Emperor of the West,³ and was invited by him to his Court to assist in carrying out his vast educational projects, and became his confidential adviser. Thus an Englishman's influence was felt not only in the countries ruled over by Charlemagne (France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Hungary), but all over Europe.

¹ See Appendix D, Tithes.

² At a Council of Clovesho in A.D. 803. The Papal consent was obtained beforehand; and Higbert, the first and only Archbishop of Lichfield, resigned his novel dignity.

³ Charlemagne (*Carolus Magnus*, or Charles the Great) ruled from A.D. 768 to 814. With his coronation at Rome by the Pope on Christmas Day, A.D. 800 (see below), commences the “Holy Roman Empire,” which survived in name for a thousand years, till finally extinguished by Napoleon in A.D. 1806.

§ 75. *The Iconoclastic Controversy in the East.*—If the most momentous event of the seventh century was the rise of the Mohammedan power (§ 42), that of this eighth century was the great *Iconoclastic Controversy*. It raged round the question of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the worship of the sacred pictures or *icons*,¹ which, in spite of protests from Christian teachers and leaders,² had become firmly established, with other lapses from primitive purity, before the close of the sixth century. (Compare p. 37, n. 3.) In A.D. 716-18 the Mohammedans had again (see § 42) been thundering at the gates of Constantinople. Their rapid successes, and their fierce and scornful denunciations of idolatry, had helped to rouse the Christian conscience; and, nine years later, the Emperor Leo III., the Isaurian, issued at Constantinople an edict, proscribing all the religious pictures (A.D. 727). No effort seems to have been made to educate the public mind on the question, or to soften the suddenness of the blow levelled at the popular religion. It was simply an attempt to carry a religious revolution through by sheer brute force. In the West the Popes flatly refused to obey the imperial edict, and, glad of the excuse, flung off the yoke of Constantinople (p. 14, n. 1) altogether.³ In the East

¹ The term “Image-worship” is seriously misleading. The icons (*eikōnes*) of the East are “not modelled or carved figures,” but “mosaics, or pictures on a flat surface, sometimes appearing in relief by the arrangement of silver or other metals by which they were set off.”—BETTANY, *Judaism and Christianity*, p. 294. The Greek Church prohibits all *statues*.

² E.g. Eusebius of Cæsarea, Epiphanius, and S. Gregory the Great himself, who, discussing the question, points out at great length that pictures were placed in churches “*non ad adorandum, sed ad instruendas solummodo mentes nescientium.*”—*Ep. ix. 9.*

³ “And so by treason and rebellion maintained their idolatry” (Homily ii. 2, pt. 2). Against the Lombards of Italy the Popes were soon obliged to appeal for aid to the Franks, whose king, Pepin, after his conquest of Italy, handed over to the Pope the territories which had hitherto belonged to the Exarchate of Ravenna (compare p. 20, n. 1), and by this gift unhappily transformed the Popes into *secular princes*, these lands becoming henceforth the “States of the Church” (A.D. 755).

there were endless tumults and massacres till the death of the Emperor Constantine V. (Leo's son) in A.D. 775. An influential Council convened by him at Constantinople in A.D. 754 had severely condemned the icons;¹ but in A.D. 787 a Council of Nicæa—known as the Seventh General Council—convened by the Empress Irene, and attended by two Papal delegates, decreed the use of an inferior kind of worship (*προσκύνησις*) as due to pictures and images of the Saviour and His Mother, and of Angels and Saints.

§ 76. *The “Caroline Books.” Council of Frankfort.*—But the matter was by no means ended. To the Western mind the prostration before pictures or images was an intolerable insult to the Majesty of God, and the decrees of the Second Nicene Council were deeply resented by Charlemagne and his advisers. Either by Alcuin, or at least under his immediate supervision, were composed the famous “Caroline Books” (*Libri Carolini*) which Charlemagne issued in A.D. 790 in his own name, and in which the whole question was discussed, and the arguments adduced at the Council contemptuously dismissed. This was followed up by a great Council of the West, held at Frankfort in A.D. 794, under Charlemagne's presidency, which solemnly repudiated the worship of images of any kind. The Council was attended by three hundred Bishops of France and Germany, Lombardy and England, with two delegates from the Pope.² A powerful opposition party remained even in the East; and the icons were again proscribed by Leo V., the Armenian, in A.D. 814. They were, however, finally restored by the Empress Theodora in A.D. 842.³

¹ They had found a defender in the able John of Damascus (†750).

² This Council also condemned the curious *Adoptionist* heresy, which had recently sprung up in Spain.

³ The popular feeling in Russia now about the sacred pictures is eloquently described in a very remarkable passage by Dean Stanley (“Eastern Church,” pp. 304, 305).

§ 77. *Death of Alcuin. Fame of the English Church.*—In his old age Alcuin became Abbot of S. Martin's monastery at Tours (A.D. 796-804), to which students flocked as eagerly as before to York. These great English scholars and missionaries, Aldhelm and Bede, Willibrord and Boniface, Alcuin, and many another of lesser repute, raised the fame of the English Church, their mother, to the highest pitch. “In a single century” England had become “known to Christendom as a fountain of light, as a land of learned men, of devout and unwearied missions, of strong, rich, and pious Kings.”¹ And all this time the work of Church endowment was steadily going on (§ 57), and property and wealth unstintingly devoted to God’s perpetual service.

¹ Bishop Stubbs, “Const. Hist.” vol. i., p. 219.

CHAPTER V

THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES, AND PART OF THE ELEVENTH. ENGLAND AND THE DANES

“The first sight of the Northmen is as if the hand on the dial of history had gone back three hundred years. . . . Christian priests were again slain at the altar by the worshippers of Woden ; letters, arts, religion, government, disappeared before these Northmen as before the Northmen of old. But when the wild burst of the storm was over, land, people, government, reappeared unchanged. England still remained England ; the conquerors sank quietly into the mass of those around them ; and Woden yielded without a struggle to Christ.”—J. R. GREEN, *Short History of the English People*, p. 45.

“Sweetly sang the monks at Ely ;
Knut the king row’d nigh :
‘Listen how the winds be bringing
From yon church a holy singing !
Row, men, nearer by.’”

§ 78. *The First King of England. Coming of the Northmen. The Donation of Ethelwulf.*—The change from the eighth century to the ninth is dramatic indeed. The eighth century had been one of the most prosperous ; the ninth proved one of the most disastrous in the annals of the English Church. Egbert, of the Royal line of Wessex, after long years of exile (through the hostility of King Offa of Mercia) at Charlemagne’s Court abroad, mounted his ancestral throne in A.D. 802, crushed Cornwall, the last district where British independence lingered,¹ in 823, and received the submission of the rival English kingdoms,

¹ Cumbria had submitted to Egfrid of Northumbria in A.D. 680 (§§ 52, 58) ; Strathclyde to Eadberht of Northumbria in 756 ; and Wales itself to Offa of Mercia in 779.

Mercia and Northumbria (§ 64) in the year 828, thus uniting the whole country for the first time *under one sceptre*.¹ But now a series of heathen invasions from Norway and Denmark began, and the English Christians underwent the same terrible ordeal of fire and sword that their own heathen forefathers had inflicted on the British Christians four centuries earlier (§ 20). The attacks of the pirate Northmen, the "Vikings"² from Scandinavia, began as early as Offa's reign, in the eighth century; and the whole of the ninth century was a period of frightful suffering and disaster, in which fierce hordes of heathen invaders were constantly pouring into England; roving to and fro over the country; burning and plundering, torturing and massacring, wherever they went; and hating with a deadly hatred everything Christian.³ The monasteries, the only centres of learning and knowledge, were one after another pillaged and destroyed; and the light of English learning, which had so recently illuminated the Continent, went suddenly out. The reign of Ethelwulf, Egbert's son (A.D. 838-58), was one long struggle with these dreaded sea-rovers; and his famous donation to the Church of a tenth of his lands and goods (so often confused with the payment of tithes)⁴ marks the urgency of the crisis. Ethelwulf also visited Rome, restored Ine's school there (§ 66), and confirmed the gift of Peter's Pence (§ 73).

§ 79. *Gottschalk. Paschasius and Ratramn. The Forged Decretals.*—To the middle of the ninth century belong two important religious controversies, both

¹ Compare p. 33, n. 1, and p. 89, n. 2.

² Vik-ings, *i.e.* sons of the *vik*, or creek.

³ It was at this very time that Anskar, the heroic "Apostle of the North," was labouring, in spite of tremendous obstacles, to introduce Christianity into Denmark and Sweden, from Hamburg (A.D. 826-65). Christianity was not finally established in Denmark till the reign of Canute (§ 91).

⁴ The evidence of the Chronicles makes it clear that the King's grant referred to land, and not at all to tithes of increase. See Appendix D Tithes.

destined to become again prominent hereafter in Reformation times. Gottschalk,¹ a monk of Fulda, attempted, like Calvin in the sixteenth century, to push the Predestination doctrine of S. Augustine, the great African Father (§ 17), to what he considered its logical issues (A.D. 847-63). His novel views on *Predestination to Damnation*, and on *Particular Redemption* (the idea, that is, that Christ died only for the elect), were vigorously met and combated by Raban Maur, Archbishop of Mainz, Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, and the learned Irish scholar and philosopher, Joannes Scotus, the wonderful ninth-century precursor of the later Schoolmen (§ 129). Still more important was the outbreak, for the first time in the history of the Church,² of controversy on the manner of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament of His Love. A treatise published in A.D. 831 by Pascharius Radbert, monk and Abbot of Corbey in Westphalia, and presented by him, about A.D. 844, to the Frankish King, offended many pious minds by its startling materialism, which led the way to, although it fell short of,³ the later theory of Transubstantiation (§ 99). The balance of Eucharistic thought, overthrown by his one-sided exaggeration, was restored by Raban Maur, the Archbishop of Mainz, and by Ratramn, another learned monk of Corbey, whose very important treatise was, as we shall see, much valued by the Church of England (§ 88 below): and the unhappy controversy, which ought never to have arisen, for the present died away. To this period also belongs the first appearance of the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, which pretended to be a collection of decrees of early Bishops of Rome from the first century and the very times of the Apostles, and transferred, with sublime effrontery, to that remote epoch

¹ Gott-schalk, *i.e.* "God's servant."

² See Dean Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. ii., pp. 446, 447 (quoted below, Appendix E).

³ See Archdeacon Freeman, "Princ. of Div. Serv." vol. ii., p. 37, note d; Canon Gore, "Dissertations," p. 237.

the exercise of Papal headship. Though universally admitted now to be gross and palpable forgeries, in that uncritical age they found ready credence and acceptance, and were at once made use of by Pope Nicolas I. (A.D. 858-67) in his high-handed interferences with the liberties of the Church of France, and also in the long controversy with Constantinople in the matter of the Patriarch Photius.¹ Though built up on these admittedly fraudulent documents, the Papal claims to universal dominion (§ 97) are still upheld in their fullest extent by the Church of Rome in theory; and the theory becomes practice wherever and whenever opportunity offers. (Compare below, § 154.)

§ 80. *The Danes in England.* S. Edmund.—After King Ethelwulf's death the contest with the Northmen was maintained by his three elder sons, who, one after another—Ethelbald in A.D. 858, Ethelbert in 860, Ethelred in 866—succeeded to the English throne. In the last-mentioned year the *Danes*, following in the steps of their Viking kinsmen, began a systematic subjugation of the country, and in the short space of four years all England north of the Thames was in their hands. The King of East Anglia, S. Edmund, who fell into their power, was bound by them to a tree, scourged, shot at with arrows, and finally beheaded, because he would not apostatize from the Christian faith (A.D. 870).² The great monastery of Ely, founded by S. Etheldreda in the time of Archbishop Theodore (§ 52) had, in the same year, shared the fate of many another and gone up in flames. Then King Ethelred himself fell in the fierce struggle of Wessex for existence, and all hope seemed at an end (A.D. 871).

¹ Photius, a man of deep learning, was Patriarch of Constantinople from A.D. 857 to 867, and again from 878 to 886. The Eighth "General" Council (Greek) in 879 reversed and anathematized the Eighth "General" Council (Roman) of 869 (which had anathematized Photius), and reasserted its independence of Rome. Compare § 97, end.

² He is commemorated on November 20th (Appendix P, p. 359). The great Abbey of S. Edmundsbury (Bury St. Edmunds) rose over his remains.

§ 81. *Alfred the Great.*—It was now that Ethelwulf's youngest son, ALFRED, came forward to save England and English Christianity. By patient waiting and desperate fighting he finally broke the power of the Danes in the fateful battle of Ethandune ; and then by the cession of half England at the Peace of Wedmore (A.D. 878) he induced them to settle down and become Christians : and being of the same race and blood as the English themselves, they were by degrees absorbed into and became a part of the great English nation.

§ 82. *Revival of Learning. Alfred's Code of Laws.*—King Alfred made the most strenuous efforts to repair the fearful losses the country had suffered in the long agony of the struggles with the Northmen. He invited to his Court learned men from Wales and from the Continent—among them, Plegmund, a hermit of Chester, who became Archbishop of Canterbury ; Asser, an Abbot from Wales ; Grimwald, from St. Omer ; and John, who became the King's own chaplain, from Corbey. He founded fresh schools¹ and monasteries ; and himself translated into English (or rather into the Wessex dialect of it) several books, including Bede's "Ecclesiastical History of the Nation of the English" (§ 68) and the "Compendium of Universal History" by Orosius, a writer of the fifth century.² The great English Chronicle in its present form is due to Alfred. To the code of laws, which he drew up from those of Ethelbert, Ine, and Offa, he prefixed the Ten Commandments, and selections from the Mosaic Law. Nobly this great King spent himself in his people's service : and he won their abundant love and gratitude in return. In A.D. 886 he was strong

¹ The foundation or revival of Oxford is, on very dubious tradition, ascribed to him, and that of Cambridge (see § 37) to his son and successor, Edward the Elder. Compare § 129 below.

² S. Gregory's "Pastoral Rule," S. Augustine's "Soliloquies," "The Consolation of Philosophy" by Boethius, and portions of the Psalter, were also translated by this famous scholar-King.

enough to wrest back London and half Essex from the Danes ; and in 893-7 he discomfited a fresh host of marauding Danes under Hasting.

§ 83. *The Tenth Century. S. Dunstan.*—Alfred the Great, one of the most loyal of the Church's sons and best of Kings, died—almost a thousand years ago—in the opening year of the tenth century (A.D. 901). The utmost efforts of the next three English Kings—his son Edward the Elder, who received the submission both of Wales and Scotland,¹ and his grandsons Athelstan and Edmund the Magnificent—were needed to carry on the great work of his life, the subjection of the turbulent Danes, and their transformation into peaceful and Christian subjects. This work, so essential to English progress, was finally taken up and carried to completion by one of the great ecclesiastical statesmen of England, the famous Archbishop of Canterbury, S. Dunstan. He had been made by King Edmund Abbot of Glastonbury (A.D. 942), and one of his chief advisers. Edmund was followed on the throne by another brother, Edred (A.D. 947), and after him came no less than *four boy-Kings* in succession, Edwy (955), his brother Edgar the Peaceful (958), and the latter's two sons, Edward the Martyr (975)² and Ethelred the Unready (979). During all these years the real power was in the hands of Dunstan ; and, being appointed by Edgar Archbishop of Canterbury, he became, like Wolsey in later days (§ 196), supreme both in Church and State. Under his wise rule Englishmen and Danes were treated as equals ; and the process of their amalgamation thus went rapidly forward. As early as Edmund's reign, a Dane named Odo actually became Archbishop of Canterbury (A.D. 942), promoted to that high office through Dunstan's influence with the King.

¹ Edward the Elder founded the sees of Wells, Crediton, and Ramsbury. He died in A.D. 925 ; and Athelstan in 940.

² See below, § 85, and Appendix P, p. 359.

§ 84. *Restoration of the Monastic System. Rivalry of Regulars and Seculars.*—This Archbishop, Odo the Severe, with the powerful support of Dunstan (who himself was afterwards to succeed him in the Primacy) began a vigorous reform of the English Church, remedying the abuses which had crept in during the troublous period of the Danish struggles, and aiming especially at the restoration of the monasteries, and of the whole monastic system which the Danes had so completely broken up. In Edgar's reign the monastery of Ely, after a century of ruin and desolation (§ 80), was restored ; and between forty and fifty other monasteries sprang into life in this single reign. The monastic clergy were known as "Regulars," because they lived under a strict rule (*regula*) in a monastery. The parish priests, on the other hand, were known as "Seculars," because they lived in the world (*seculum*), free to marry, and subject only to the Bishops. Odo and Dunstan looked with disfavour on the marriage of the clergy, and attempted, but in vain, to force celibacy on all the clergy. All efforts to make the English clergy like those of Rome in this respect failed, till they were renewed, under the influence of Hildebrand (§ 97), by Lanfranc and Anselm after the Norman Conquest (see § 111). And the rivalry between the two classes of clergy, the Regulars and the Seculars, continued uninterruptedly down to the time of the Reformation.¹

§ 85. *S. Dunstan and Ethelred.*—In the reign of Edgar the Peaceful (A.D. 958-75) S. Dunstan was at the height of his power : and he maintained it, though with ever-increasing difficulty, during the brief reign of Edward the Martyr, who was foully murdered by his stepmother, Elfrida, in A.D. 978,² and the feeble boy-

¹ Numerous curious traces of this rivalry and mutual contempt survive in our early literature, and even in some of our parish churches and Cathedrals.

² See Appendix P, p. 359.

hood of Ethelred. But this latter King soon showed himself determined to take the reins of government entirely into his own incapable hands ; and Dunstan therefore retired to Canterbury, where he died in A.D. 988. His gentle and loving temperament, his fondness for poetry and learning and skilful handicraft, and his splendid services to the English Church and Nation, were long remembered, and he is still commemorated by us on May 19th.¹ In modern times his fair fame has been successfully vindicated² from the aspersions cast upon it since the Reformation times, and he has taken his true place again as one of the makers of England.

§ 86. *The Church of Rome in the Tenth Century.*—While Alfred was reigning and fighting in England, and during the whole of the following century, the tenth, the Church of Rome was passing through one of those awful periods over which Romanists would fain draw a veil, and which prove uncontestedly that, in spite of all her high pretensions, she is as liable as any other portion of the Church to error and corruption. Rome was the scene of the wildest anarchy. Pope Stephen VI. (A.D. 896-7) tore the body of his predecessor, Pope Formosus, from its grave, placed it in full pontificals in the Papal chair, held a hideous mock-trial of it, and then had the mouldering corpse flung into the Tiber ! His successor reigned only three months ; and his successor only twenty days. Under the "Rule of the Harlots," in the tenth century, three Roman ladies of good position but infamous life—Theodora and her daughters—obtained the Papacy for their own paramours, and for their offspring to the second generation. During sixty years (A.D. 903-63) no less than thirteen Popes, monsters of depravity, followed one another on the Papal throne. At length an opportunity for outside interference came ; and the German

¹ Appendix P, p. 359.

² A convenient account of his life and work will be found in Dean Spence's "Ch. of Eng." vol. i., ch. 19.

King, Otho the Great, being invited by the infamous Pope John XII. to give him aid, and crowned by him Emperor at Rome (A.D. 962),¹ exerted himself to procure the *deposition* of this same Pope the following year by a synod, and took drastic measures to secure order. He died in A.D. 973 ; and the Eternal City remained still a scene of tumults and confusion, of "rivalries, depositions, and murders of successive pontiffs," down to the very end of the century. In A.D. 991 we find a Bishop of Orleans publicly describing the Popes, in the synod of S. Basle, as "very Antichrists sitting in the temple of God" (see 2 Thess. ii. 4) ; while the contemporary Gerbert, destined himself to be one day Pope (§ 89), writes to a friend that "the morals of the Romans are the horror of the whole world."²

§ 87. *Return of the Danes. Ethelred the Unready.*—The statesman-prelate Dunstan was in his grave, when the black clouds once more began to gather over his beloved England. Heathen Danes from abroad again appeared upon her shores, ravaging as they had done in Alfred's time, a century before. Ethelred the Unready (so called because he would not listen to the *rede*, or good advice, of others) attempted to buy off the invaders from time to time with large sums of money, a policy which, of course, completely failed.

§ 88. *The Homilies of Aelfric.*—In the Primacy of Archbishop Sigeric (A.D. 990-4) two books of *Homilies* (forty in each volume) were set forth for use in the Church of England, as was again done at the Reformation (§ 276), and with the same object, that a sermon might be heard by the people every Sunday. S. Dunstan had issued a stringent canon on this subject ; and the publication of these Homilies shows how fully the leading Churchmen of those days, as of these, recognized the

¹ Thus was revived again the "Holy Roman Empire": see p. 58, n. 3. See further below, § 97.

² "Student's Ecc. Hist." vol. i., pp. 572-581. Compare the concluding part of the Homily for Whit-Sunday.

extreme importance of preaching as a part of the functions of the ministry. The writer of these authorized Homilies was Aelfric the Grammian, who afterwards himself succeeded Sigeric as Archbishop;¹ and one of these Homilies in particular, that for Easter Day, has a special interest for us as showing clearly that the authorized teaching of our Church then was the same as now on the controverted question of the Holy Eucharist; that, in contradistinction to the views put forward by Paschasius (§ 79), she held to the position of those great writers in the Frankish Church,² who opposed the coarse materialism which seems to us so strange (S. John, vi. 63).³

§ 89. *Expected End of the World.*—The year 1000 being now at hand, there was a widespread expectation of the end of the world (compare Rev. xx. 2 ff.), which became almost universal. Pilgrims flocked in ever-increasing numbers to the Holy Land: and their sufferings from the Saracens led to the first idea of the CRUSADES (see below, § 106) in the mind of Pope Sylvester II. (of magic fame),⁴ who in A.D. 999 had been nominated to the Papacy by the young Emperor Otho III.

§ 90. *The Eleventh Century. Conquest of England by the Danes.*—The tenth century had been, on the whole, one of progress and prosperity both in Church and State; but the eleventh, to which we now come,

¹ See Appendix B. The identification is all but certain. Besides composing the Homilies and a Latin Grammar, Aelfric translated into English a large part of the Old Testament, and wrote two important Epistles, which throw much light upon the condition of the Church of England at this time.

² The Homily is based throughout on the Latin work of Ratramn.

³ Compare Archdeacon Wilberforce, "Holy Eucharist," p. 345; and see below, Appendix G.

⁴ This Pope, better known under his real name, Gerbert, introduced the use of the Arabic numerals and the decimal notation, when teacher at Rheims: he had learned them from the Saracens of Spain (§ 42). Gerbert's mechanical skill was extraordinary, and earned him in that ignorant age a reputation for witchcraft.

opened in blood and fire. In the year 1002 King Ethelred, provoked by the continual inroads of the Danes (§ 87), ordered a foolish and treacherous slaughter of their peaceable kinsfolk in England (*Massacre of S. Brice's Day*),¹ in which, among many others, the King of Denmark's own sister, Gunhilda, miserably perished. The revenge of the infuriated Danes and Sweyn, their King, was immediate and effective. For twelve fearful years they harried our unhappy land, ravaging, plundering, and torturing. The gentle S. Elphege or Alphege (Elfheah), Archbishop of Canterbury in succession to Aelfric (§ 88), was dragged away from his burning Cathedral a prisoner, and at length pelted to death by his savage captors with ox-bones at Greenwich (the station of the Danish fleet) in one of their drunken revels.² The end came in A.D. 1013. The weak and irresolute English King fled across sea to his wife's kindred in Normandy ;³ and the Danish conquest of England by King Sweyn ended, after some years of heroic and successful struggle by Ethelred's son, Edmund Ironside, in the sole possession of the throne of England by Sweyn's son and successor, CNUT, or Canute.

§ 91. *Reign of Canute*.—Canute, who reigned in England from A.D. 1016 to 1035, proved, contrary to all expectations, one of the wisest and most popular Kings that England has ever had. Taught by the Church the holy and powerful truths of Christianity, he laid aside his heathenism and his natural savagery, and became a model Christian King, sparing no effort

¹ For S. Brice, see Appendix P, p. 357.

² Appendix P, p. 359. The parish church of Greenwich is on the spot where he fell.

³ Normandy had been ceded in A.D. 911 by Charles the Simple to the Vikings, under their renowned leader Rollo, on the condition (compare § 81) that they became Christians. The connection between Normandy and England, which had such momentous consequences afterwards (see § 96), began with the marriage of Ethelred the Unready (in A.D. 1002) with Emma, daughter of Rollo's grandson, Richard Sans Peur. She was known for her beauty as the "Gem of Normandy."

to advance the honour of God and God's Church, and to evangelize his own heathen countrymen abroad. He treated English and Danes exactly alike, and thus nobly carried out the work that S. Dunstan had initiated, of making them one nation (§ 83). He married Ethelred's widow, Emma of Normandy; and for twenty years he ruled Church and State in a just and upright and truly conscientious manner, winning the affections of the English to an extraordinary degree. Never was there a King more beloved than Canute the Dane. In A.D. 1027 he paid a visit to Rome; and from thence wrote the celebrated letter to the English nation which lays bare to us his whole heart, and discloses his inmost thoughts and aspirations. His rebuke to the courtly flatterers on the sea-shore at Southampton is told and re-told to English children still; and equally well-known is the story of his being rowed one day on the fen-waters which then surrounded Ely, and how deeply touched he was as there came floating to his ears over the wild waste of waters the joyful strains of the monks of Ely as they kept the Festival of the Lord's Ascension in the distant monastery.

§ 92. *The Royal Supremacy.*—Canute exercised to the full the Royal Supremacy over the Church which is so often supposed to have been invented by Henry VIII. at the Reformation, but which had been, as we have already seen, constantly enjoyed by our Kings from the very first as Christian monarchs of a Christian people (§ 65). Thus we find Canute appointing the English Bishops, investing them with the ring and pastoral staff, which symbolized their spiritual authority (see § 107 below), and with their help enacting laws in the National Council both for Church and State. In the Jewish polity, founded, let us never forget, under God's own direction, the Church and State were ONE, the Church being simply the *Nation at worship*; and so God permitted it to be with England for

more than nine hundred years.¹ It was not till the reign of Elizabeth that the earliest of the now multitudinous sects began to break away from their fellow Christians in the National Church, and so to bring incalculable harm upon the cause of Christianity by needless *divisions*.

§ 93. *Accession of Edward the Confessor.*—On the death of Canute's two sons and successors, Harold "Harefoot" (A.D. 1035-40) and Hardicanute (A.D. 1040-2), the way was open for the recall of the English line to the throne. The Unready himself had died long since, in the struggle before Canute's accession : but his son Edward, as Canute's stepson (§ 91) was already resident at the English Court ; and he now became King of England (A.D. 1042).

§ 94. *Norman Favourites. England and Rome.*—The accession of Edward, called "the Confessor" from his saintly life, drew Normandy and England more closely together than ever before. The new King naturally began to shower some of the chief offices both in Church and State on the Norman friends who came trooping over to him. This policy provoked strong indignation among the native English : and by the determined action of Godwin, Earl of Wessex, who had been the trusted minister of Canute and had lately secured the crown for Edward, the hated foreigners were at length driven over sea. The closer relations with Normandy brought England into closer relations also with Rome, which, as we shall see hereafter, had just been vigorously reformed by the German Emperor, Henry III. (§ 97). And now for the first time for centuries (see § 72) we hear again of an attempt at Papal interference with England. One of the Bishops thus forced to fly was Robert of Jumièges, the Norman Archbishop of Canterbury ; and he, very naturally, appealed to Rome to be

¹ See Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." bk. viii., chs. 1-7.

restored to his see. But, as in the former case of Wilfrid (§§ 52, 61), the English, though full of respect for the distant Pope, did not admit his interference here,¹ and Stigand, Bishop of Winchester, was appointed to the Primacy. It was not till after the Norman Conquest that the Popes were able, little by little, to enlarge their power in England, especially when a weak monarch was on the throne, until the Reformation finally restored the National Church to her ancient independence under the Crown. It is too often forgotten that the endowments of the Church of England *never belonged to the Church of Rome*. They were given originally to the Church of England, the National Church in this land, whose growth and progress we have been noting ; and to her they still belong, and, we may trust, will always belong, in spite of all the efforts made from time to time, partly by those ignorant of her true history, partly by those who hate her Divine mission and influence, to despoil her.

§ 95. *Pious Foundations. Westminster Abbey.*—Among the many benefactors of the Church, Earl Harold, Godwin's son, hereafter destined himself to a few pathetic months of Kingship, holds a prominent place by his foundation of a splendid secular college at Waltham (A.D. 1060), which, however, over a century later, was given up by Henry II. to monks (compare § 84). In the North Ealdred, Archbishop of York, was an unwearied reformer and church builder, to whom both Beverley and York Minster owe much. And in the Midlands must be mentioned Earl Leofric and his wife Godiva, famous in story, who were “celebrated throughout the length and breadth of England for their boundless liberality to ecclesiastical founda-

¹ “The distance of England from Italy, which had helped to deliver our borders from the political tyranny of imperial Rome, served also to protect the liberties of our church from the spiritual thralldom of papal Rome.”—J. J. BLUNT, *Sketch of the Reformation*, ch. iii., init. See above, § 65, and Bishop Stubbs, “Const. Hist.” vol. i., pp. 245, 246.

tions, and their ceaseless care for the Church.”¹ The Confessor himself, in return for Papal absolution from his vow of pilgrimage to Rome, erected the magnificent “West Minster,” on the site of the very ancient monastery in Thorn-ey (see § 32) close by London, to be “the place of the King’s constitution and coronation for ever”; and it has been the usual Coronation Church of our monarchs ever since. It was consecrated three days after the Christmas of A.D. 1065, while the saintly English King lay dying. Early in the new year, on Twelfth-day eve, Edward the Confessor passed peacefully away. So deep was the impression which he, the last of the “Old-English” rulers, left behind him in the heart of the people, that he became for two centuries the patron saint of England.²

¹ Dean Spence, “Ch. of Eng.” vol. ii., p. 67.

² He is commemorated on October 13th (Appendix P, p. 360).

CHAPTER VI

FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY TO THE MIDDLE OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY. ENGLAND UNDER THE NORMANS

"The Popes attempted, at this period of the Middle Ages, to create an independent throne of truth and justice, above the passions and the force which reigned in the world around. . . . The idea was imperfectly realized : it was marred by the extravagance of assertion, the imperiousness of temper, the violence of means with which these claims were urged ; it was . . . fatally degraded and discredited by the selfish and faithless temporizing and the shameless greediness which grew into proverbs wherever the name of Rome was mentioned. And every succeeding century these things grew worse."—DEAN CHURCH, *Life of Anselm*.

"The roots of the present lie deep in the past, and nothing in the past is dead to the man who would learn how the present comes to be what it is."—BISHOP STUBBS.

§ 96. *The Norman Conquest. William I.*—And now the Church of England underwent a new and critical stage in her eventful history. Normandy across the water, the Viking settlement of Rollo in A.D. 911 (p. 72, n. 3), had soon become famous throughout Christendom for its splendid audacity and gallantry in war, and no less splendid devotion to the Christian faith, for its novel architecture, "its lordly minsters, its vast monasteries, its schools, and even for its literature."¹ Its mighty Duke William had long had his eyes on England, which had been closely connected with Normandy since the time of Ethelred (§ 90) ; and in A.D. 1066, on the death of his kinsman, the childless

¹ Dean Spence, "Ch. of Eng." vol. ii., p. 30.

Edward the Confessor, he boldly clutched at the tempting prize, claiming the crown of England as a promise from Edward, and pouring his troops across the Channel. The new English King, Harold, Earl Godwin's son (§ 95), fell, gallantly fighting, at Hastings : and the Norman Conquest took place. Church and State had alike to own the dominion of foreigners, who, however, did not remain foreigners long, but, like the Danes before them, gradually became completely merged in the great English nation.¹ William the Norman, like Canute the Dane, tried to rule as far as possible as a real *English King*.²

§ 97. *The Revival of Rome. Hildebrand. Schism with the East.*—We must here pause and turn our eyes again to Rome. After Pope Sylvester II. (§ 89) the Roman see had sunk back into its former horrible state of “utter confusion and moral impotence” (§ 86). The Papacy was for a long time “bought and sold like a piece of merchandise.” In A.D. 1046 there were three Popes fighting for the tiara, Benedict IX., Sylvester III., and Gregory VI. (compare § 179 below). The powerful German Emperor, Henry III. (A.D. 1039-56), now intervened as head of the “Holy Roman Empire”; ³ he procured the *deposition* of the three rivals, and himself nominated a new Pope, Clement II., keeping in his own hands henceforth the sole right of nomination. Thus the Papacy at length emerged from the awful scandals of the tenth century (§ 86); and under Leo IX., the “first of the great mediæval Popes” (A.D. 1048-54) it began to aim at

¹ The wonderful capacity of the English race to absorb foreign nationalities has been since shown on a great scale in America.

² The ancient English institutions of the Shire-Moot and Hundred-Moot (§ 65), and the old national customs, were left untouched, and supplied the foundation on which Henry I. and Henry II. afterwards built up the great fabric of English law. See Bishop Stubbs, “Const. Hist.” vol. i., pp. 267 ff., and below, §§ 116, 119.

³ See p. 70, n. 1. Its essential idea was the conjoint supremacy of Emperor and Pope as civil and ecclesiastical heads respectively of the Western Empire. Compare above, pp. 58, n. 3, 59.

nothing less than the absolute sovereignty of the world. The guiding spirit of the new movement was the famous monk of Clugny,¹ Hildebrand, who in his vast claims for the Papacy far outwent the False Decretals (§ 79). To Hildebrand the Pope was the feudal head of Christendom, with supreme power over all kingdoms and princes throughout the world, a conception of the Papacy which, though never more than partially realized,² dominated henceforward the whole mediæval period. As a first step, the control of the German Emperors was quietly shaken off, the election to the Papacy being placed no longer, as hitherto, in the hands of the Roman clergy and people, or those of the Emperor as acknowledged Sovereign of Rome, but given to a close ecclesiastical corporation, the CARDINALS,³ which has ever since been allowed to dictate to the Roman Church who is to be her Bishop—generally, of course, though not invariably, one of its own members. The long minority of the Emperor Henry IV. gave the opportunity for effecting this momentous change (A.D. 1059), which was in itself a revolution of the most far-reaching consequence.⁴ The elaborate system put into gradual operation by Hildebrand included a universal right of *appeal* to Rome, a universal enforcement of *clerical celibacy*,⁵ the exaction of an *oath of allegiance* from Metropolitans as the price of their pall (compare § 29), and the appointment of permanent *Papal legates* in every kingdom, to look after the interests of the Papacy

¹ The *Cluniac* Order of reformed Benedictines had been founded by Abbot Berno in A.D. 912; and Clugny had now become the centre of a vast monastic organization, whose immense influence was at Hildebrand's disposal.

² It broke down hopelessly in practice. (See heading to this chapter.)

³ These were originally the priests of the chief churches in Rome, together with the seven Bishops who assisted the Pope. The first true step towards reform in the Roman Church would be the recovery, by the Italian nation and its Sovereign, of the ancient right to select its own chief Bishop.

⁴ See Dean Milman, "Latin Christianity," bk. vi., ch. 3.

⁵ See Milman, *op. cit.*, vol. iii., pp. 46 ff. Compare above, § 84.

and control the Bishops of the country, in order to bring every National Church under the Roman obedience, and centralize Christendom under one head. If the audacity of the attempt, and the barrier which it interposed to the turbulence and lawlessness of those times, win the admiration of historians, we may sadly reflect that it was from the beginning foredoomed to failure : it was unscriptural, unprimitive, uncatholic ; it filled the Western Church with strife, confusion, and blood ;¹ and it completed the rent between Eastern and Western Christendom, which is the sad bequest of the mediæval Church to ourselves. One half of the Catholic Church, the vast Orthodox Church of the East, has always steadfastly set itself against the Roman claim to headship, based mainly on a perverted text² and a handful of forged documents,³ and so entirely alien to Catholic antiquity, of which the East has always shown itself the tenacious guardian. The final schism between East and West, which continues to this day, was consummated in A.D. 1054 ; and the Eastern Church still excommunicates the Pope, and condemns his claim to supremacy as “the chief heresy of the latter days.”⁴

§ 98. *William I. and the Pope. The Royal Supremacy.*—This, then, was the great change which had come over the position of the Church of Rome, just at the time when the Norman Conquest brought the Church of England, for good and for ill, in far closer relations with that of Rome than ever before. The

¹ Compare Milman, *I.c.*, pp. 81, 82 ; and see below.

² The application of the text, S. Matt. xvi. 18, to the Church of Rome is quite unknown to primitive times.

³ See above, § 79.

⁴ Stanley, “Eastern Church,” p. 46. The *pretexts* for the final quarrel—chiefly the Western use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist and the insertion of the *Filioque* in the Nicene Creed—were capable of easy adjustment. The real crux was, as always, the Papal lordship (1 Pet. v. 2, 3). Compare pt. v. of our Homily against Wilful Rebellion ; and on the Double Procession see Archdeacon Wilberforce, “Holy Eucharist,” pp. 272-274, 293, and below, p. 87, n. 2.

way seemed at last to be opened for the establishment of Roman dominion in England, especially as William had invited and secured the aid of the Pope before his invasion. But the Norman King showed himself fully alive to the danger that threatened the independence of the ancient National Church, at the head of which he now found himself. When the Pope sent to demand homage (§ 97) from him, he returned a curt and decided refusal : “*Homage to thee I have not chosen nor do I choose to render. I never promised it, nor do I find that my predecessors ever did it to thy predecessors.*”¹ The collection of Peter’s Pence he permitted to continue, as a long-established custom (§§ 73, 78), though not as tribute. And the Papal legates, sent to congratulate him, were employed in the ecclesiastical proceedings by which as many as possible of the English Bishops and Abbots were on various pretexts deposed to make way for Normans.² But William maintained firmly the *Supremacy over the Church* which his predecessors had enjoyed (§ 65), and which, though temporarily obscured in some of the reigns of weaker Kings that followed him, was claimed back finally at the Reformation. No letters from the Pope might be received in England, no Papal legate might land, no English synod might enact canons, no Bishop might either sue or sentence a baron or Royal officer without the King’s express consent obtained beforehand. The history of the next five hundred years is, as we shall see, largely a history of the Papal attempts to break down this Royal Supremacy, which militated so seriously against the Roman plans of universal rule, and, rightly interpreted, has always been the bulwark of our national independence. (See below, §§ 161-2, 198, 234-5.)

¹ The King’s reply is quoted by Lanfranc himself (Epist. 10).

² The saintly English Bishop Wulfstan remained untouched in his see of Worcester, and Siward at Rochester. No one of English birth, however, was appointed again to any Bishopric till the reign of Henry I. (§ 107).

§ 99. Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Eucharistic Controversy.—The deposition of Archbishop Stigand (§ 94) was effected at the Synod of Winchester in A.D. 1070, nominally on the grounds that he had supplanted his predecessor in the Primacy and used his pall, had retained the Bishopric of Winchester in plurality, and had recognized the Antipope Benedict X. (A.D. 1058-9); but really because, as a prominent English patriot, he would have been an insuperable obstacle to the new Norman arrangements. In his place as Archbishop the King appointed his own closest ecclesiastical friend and adviser, Lanfranc, formerly Prior of Bec, and now Abbot of Caen. This famous scholar and divine had recently published his work “*De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*,” upholding the materialist view of the Holy Eucharist, which had first been formulated by Paschasius (§ 79), and finally found expression in the theory of Transubstantiation (§ 133). This view had since the ninth century taken such firm hold upon the popular mind (which always loves extremes, and dislikes the task of balancing opposing truths) that the effort of Berengar of Tours, in A.D. 1049,¹ to reassert the more spiritual view met only with the bitterest denunciation and opposition. Berengar was twice forced to a verbal retraction, which he afterwards revoked again as extorted by fear for his life. In the next century we find no less a person than the great S. Bernard himself (§ 115) an advocate for the older and purer view;² and it was not till A.D. 1215 that the dogma of Transubstantiation was imposed as an article of faith in the Roman

¹ Following the similar efforts of Leutheric, Archbishop of Sens, and Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres, earlier in the century. The reply of Berengar, “*De Sacra Cœna*,” to Lanfranc’s work was published in A.D. 1070; and the controversy was continued with great acrimony by a Norman monk, Guitmund. See “*Student’s Ecc. Hist.*” vol. ii., pp. 314 ff.

² “To this day the same Flesh is given to us, but spiritually, not carnally.” The other view, however, unhappily prevailed.

Communion. No Council of the Universal Church has ever pronounced on this mysterious subject: and it should be noted that all through the long controversy (A.D. 1049-88) Berengar remained the close personal friend of Hildebrand, who vouched for his orthodoxy and extended to him his protection. The Church of England returned to her own earlier position (§ 88) at the Reformation, and, rejecting the dogma of Transubstantiation, which "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament" (Art. xxviii.), she imitates the Christians of the first thousand years in attempting no explanation of the *manner* of the Real Objective Presence of her Lord.¹

§ 100. *Lanfranc and the Pope.*—Lanfranc, who came to England with grave misgivings, speedily won the veneration and love of the conquered nation, intervening successfully between them and their terrible King. In A.D. 1071 he visited Rome to obtain the pall, and was received there with the highest respect and honour by his old pupil, Pope Alexander II. But, like the King (§ 98), he held markedly aloof from the schemes of Hildebrand: and when the latter, on the death of Alexander II., at length himself ascended the Papal throne as Gregory VII. (A.D. 1073-84), Lanfranc aroused his bitter displeasure by disregarding his repeated summons to come again to Rome.

§ 101. *Position of the Bishops. Ecclesiastical Courts.*—William the Conqueror made some important changes and rearrangements. The Bishops continued to sit, as they had always hitherto done, in the National Council (§ 65); but, in consequence of William's introduction of the feudal system (in a modified form), they had now to do homage and swear fealty to the King for the lands they held from him as his *vassals*, just as the secular barons had to do; and this led to trouble in the following reigns.

¹ Archdeacon Freeman, "Princ. of Divine Serv." vol. ii., *ini*. Compare below, Appendix G.

Another and still more important change was the establishment of separate ecclesiastical courts under the Bishops and their archdeacons, in place of the older system by which they had sat in the ordinary shire and hundred courts to do justice side by side with the civil magistrate. This alteration drew a sharp line of distinction, for the first time in English history, between Church and State, between clerical and lay jurisdiction.¹ It must be observed that not the purely *spiritual* courts only, but the purely *civil* courts also, had their origin from this arrangement of the Conqueror's. It was not as though the State had hitherto *domineered* over the Church, as she has been attempting to do in the present century by bringing *purely Church questions before lay judges*: but Church and State had hitherto sat in alliance at every trial (see § 65).

§ 102. Operation of the Church Courts. System of Appeal.—To the new Church courts were assigned all spiritual causes, including not only cases of immorality and Church discipline, but suits concerning matrimony and wills. The ecclesiastical law they used was the gradual growth of English synods and councils, independent of, but similar to, the Roman canon law.² Appeals were allowed from Archdeacon to Bishop, from him to Archbishop, and then to the King, who, if there appeared to be any failure of justice, sent the case back to the Archbishop's court for a second trial. *No appeal might be carried to Rome without the King's express licence.* Yet, as time went on, the system of appeals to Rome gradually grew up, which in later times reached such huge dimensions, and gave the Popes continual opportunities of interference in England (§§ 114, 121, 162).

¹ “Henceforth the bishops and archdeacons are no longer to hold ecclesiastical pleas in the hundred-court, but to have courts of their own; to try causes by canonical, not by customary law; and to allow no spiritual questions to come before laymen as judges.”—BISHOP STUBBS, *Const. Hist.*, vol. i., p. 283.

² Canon Dixon, “*Hist. Ch. Eng.*” vol. iii., pp. 361, 362.

§ 103. *Norman Church Building. The Use of Sarum.* — But on the whole the English derived immense good from the Conquest, which has ever since been looked back upon as a fresh starting-point in our history. The Norman nobles and landowners were enthusiastic church-builders ; and under the rule of the new Bishops and Abbots grand and magnificent churches, with new endowments,¹ sprang up everywhere in place of the earlier and ruder Saxon structures. A marked feature of the Norman rearrangements was the transference of sees, where desirable, from villages to larger centres : Salisbury, Chichester, Chester (for a time), Lincoln, Thetford (afterwards Norwich), and Bath now took the place of Sherborne (§ 67), Selsey (§ 52), Lichfield (§ 47), Dorchester (§ 38), Elmham (§ 55), and Wells (p. 67, n. 1) : to Durham and Exeter had already, under Edward the Confessor, been shifted the sees of Lindisfarne (§ 36) and Crediton (p. 67, n. 1). The Cathedrals of Canterbury and York, which had both been accidentally burned down, were magnificently rebuilt, and so, too, were those at Winchester (the old capital of England, § 38), Rochester, Worcester, and many more. At Ely the foundations of a new Abbey church, the present Cathedral (§ 112), were laid in A.D. 1083 by the Norman abbot, Simeon, who though already an old man of ninety, lived to see ten years of its slow and stately growth. The new Bishop of Sarum, or Salisbury, S. Osmund, was a man profoundly skilled in ritual lore, and under his supervision a careful revision of the old service-books (§ 30) was carried out. The “Use of Sarum” thus produced (A.D. 1085) became widely adopted in other dioceses, and was the chief office-book of the Church of England down to the Reformation. Other “Uses” however, existed, such as those of York, Hereford, and Bangor,² mentioned in the preface

¹ Compare Appendix D, II.

² There were also special Uses at Exeter, Lincoln, and Aberdeen. The

of our Book of Common Prayer, which is itself largely a translation and condensation of the "Use of Sarum" (§ 283). To the following year, 1086, belongs the great survey of the whole of England, the results of which are recorded in the still-existing volumes of "Domesday Book." A year later the Conqueror died at Rouen.

§ 104. *William Rufus and the Supremacy. Archbishop Anselm.*— Archbishop Lanfranc passed away in the year 1089, and the Church of England at once began to suffer from the systematic extortion of the Conqueror's godless and brutal son, William Rufus (A.D. 1087-1100). This King, with the aid of the notorious Ranulph Flambard, his chosen adviser and minister, used the Royal Supremacy in a very novel way, by refusing to appoint new Bishops to vacant sees, in order to keep their revenues as long as possible in his own hands, as feudal overlord! He also shamelessly put up ecclesiastical preferments to sale.¹ The Archbishopric itself he kept vacant for four years: but at last, frightened by a severe illness, he consented, at the urgent request and remonstrance of his Council, to nominate Anselm, the pupil and successor of Lanfranc at Bec (§ 99), and renowned even beyond him, as by far the deepest thinker of his day. Being in England, he had been summoned to the bedside of the Royal sufferer in what was supposed to be his last illness. Though shrinking inexpressibly from the onerous task thus laid upon him, this profound philosopher and divine² came now as Archbishop to add fresh lustre to the throne of Canterbury (A.D. 1093-1109).

Use of Bangor was arranged by Bishop Anian in A.D. 1267. S. Paul's Cathedral in London had an independent Use of its own till A.D. 1414 (Procter, *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 5, n.).

¹ The sin of simony had hitherto been little known in England, though rampant on the Continent till sternly put down by Hildebrand.

² See below, §§ 105, 110. His famous maintenance of *Realism* against the *Nominalist* philosopher Roscellin began in A.D. 1092.

§ 105. *S. Anselm in exile.*—The recovery of Rufus was the signal for renewed extortions, in which he found himself checked and thwarted by the firmness of the new Primate, who insisted on the restitution of lands alienated from the see by Rufus after Lanfranc's death. In this he was successful: but bitter quarrels broke out on the question of the amount of feudal "relief" to be contributed for the war in Normandy; on Anselm's claim to receive the pall from Urban II., when the King had not yet decided in his favour against the rival Pope Clement III.;¹ and again as to the amount of contribution for a war in Wales. The impossibility of working peacefully with the despotic King became more and more apparent, and at last drove the Archbishop to the extreme step of leaving England, and appealing for aid to the Pope. For three years he remained in exile, till the death of Rufus; and during this time of enforced leisure completed (A.D. 1097) that profound treatise on the Incarnation, "*Cur Deus Homo*," which forms a landmark in theology. At the Council of Bari, at which he drew out and defended the Western view of the Twofold Procession of the Holy Ghost,² the English Archbishop was treated by the Pope with the greatest respect and deference, and was even addressed by him as "*alterius orbis Papa*," "*Pope of the other world*," i.e. of the islands of the West, of which, in their proud independence, the King of

¹ Clement was the Emperor's nominee in opposition to Hildebrand (see p. 90, n. 2), and he held Rome from A.D. 1080 to 1099. Anselm had already, as Abbot of Bec, recognized Urban II.; and Rufus eventually did the same.

² The word *Filioque* ("and the Son") had been inserted in the Latin version of the Nicene Creed first in Spain in the sixth century, whence it spread to the Franks; and it was at length accepted by Rome in A.D. 1014. The Eastern Church, while recognizing the truth which the Western addition is meant to guard, has steadily rejected the word on two grounds: it is capable of a wrong interpretation; and, in any case, it could only be properly added to the Creed of Christendom by a General Council. Compare §§ 13, 54; and p. 80, n. 4.

England claimed to be *Emperor*. This is but one of the numerous indications of the recognized independence of the Church and Kingdom of England, which had never formed part of the "Holy Roman Empire."¹

§ 106. *The First Crusade. Death of Rufus.*—The year 1095 is memorable for the outbreak of the First Crusade, which ended by rescuing, in A.D. 1099, the Holy City from the infidels. For four centuries and a half Jerusalem had been in the hands of the Mohammedans (§ 42): recently, in A.D. 1076, it had passed from the Egyptian Caliphs into the possession of the fanatical and savage TURKS, who, in their steady westward advance, now occupied also Asia Minor. Their horrible ill-treatment of Christian pilgrims at Jerusalem roused Peter the Hermit, whose fervid preaching thrilled half Europe. The religious frenzy thus excited was fanned and directed by Hildebrand's successor, Pope Urban II. (§ 105). Seizing the opportunity, he put himself at the head of the movement, summoned on his own authority Councils at Placentia and Clermont, and went so far as to proclaim a *plenary indulgence*² for all Crusaders. The excitement and enthusiasm became immense and uncontrollable. "The value of property was depreciated by the eager competition of multitudes, while the price of arms and horses was raised to an exorbitant height by the wants and impatience of the buyers. . . . The myriads that pressed forwards on the holy pilgrim-

¹ The title "Emperor of Britain" was assumed by our Kings from Athelstan (§ 83), to mark England's entire independence of the Continent. Hence the significance of the Pope's title given to Anselm thus publicly (compare p. 78, n. 3, and see Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. i., p. 148). The imperial mantle with its *golden eagles* is still used at the coronation of our Sovereigns (Dr. Wickham Legge, *Sacring of the English Kings*, "Archaeological Journal," March, 1894).

² *I.e.* a release from the temporal penalties of all the sins they might commit, and therefore a direct incitement to commit them (see Appendix H). The idea of the Crusades was not novel. Both Sylvester II. at the beginning of the century (§ 89), and, quite recently, Hildebrand in A.D. 1074, had planned a Holy War for the recovery of Jerusalem.

age were a subject of astonishment to themselves and to the Greeks."—GIBBON. In A.D. 1099, "on a Friday, at three in the afternoon, the day and hour of the Passion," Jerusalem was captured from the Caliph of Egypt, who had recently recovered it from the Turks : and Godfrey of Bouillon, a direct descendant of Charlemagne (§ 74) in the female line, became the first ruler of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem. The Pope, however, died before the glorious news could reach him. In the following year the sudden death of King Rufus in the New Forest, and the accession of his brother, Henry I., the Conqueror's third and youngest son,¹ led to the immediate recall of Anselm to England.

§ 107. *Reign of Henry I. The Investiture Controversy.*—The reign of Henry I., which occupies the first part of the twelfth century, opened well and brightly. The iniquitous proceedings of the late reign were reversed, a Charter promulgated which secured the liberties of Church and State (see § 136 below), and the King's marriage with a princess of the ancient English Royal line² secured the affections of the vanquished race, and led the way in the important process of amalgamation into one nation (§ 96). But soon Archbishop Anselm found himself again in a position of sharp antagonism with his King (see § 105). The cause of contention this time was one of very great importance : it concerned a question which had been agitating Germany and Italy from the time of Hildebrand, and which was destined to agitate it yet further for years to come, long after the short, sharp contest by which it was settled in England (see below).

¹ Henry is said to have received at Cambridge, with a view to holding office in the Church (compare below, § 195, end), the education which gained him his surname of *Beaumont*.

² "Good Queen Maude," as she was called, was daughter of King Malcolm of Scotland and Margaret, the granddaughter of Edmund Ironside (§ 90). Thus she forms the link connecting Henry II., her grandson (§ 117), and all the later Sovereigns of England down to our own VICTORIA, with the ancient Royal line of Wessex (§ 78).

The question at issue was whether a Bishop was to render *homage* to his King, and whether the King might not only *nominate* a Bishop, but perform the ceremony of *investing* him with the ring and pastoral staff which symbolized his spiritual position and authority.¹ In England the practice of Investiture had prevailed from the time of Canute (§ 92), and that of homage had been recently introduced by the Conqueror (§ 101). But in A.D. 1075 Pope Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), whose fixed policy it was to free the Papacy itself, and the clergy of every land, from all civil control whatever (§ 97), issued a decree forbidding the system of Investiture, and thus initiated the first of those mighty struggles for power between Pope and Emperor—the ecclesiastical and civil heads respectively of the “Holy Roman Empire”—which were for centuries renewed again and again, and ended only in the exhaustion of both (p. 119, n. 1). The Investiture struggle in Italy and Germany lasted for nearly fifty years, and was carried on with the strangest and most bewildering vicissitudes of success and failure.² In England William the Conqueror and Archbishop Lanfranc had remained coldly aloof and neutral (§ 100). But the reign of William Rufus and his infamous conduct had now disclosed an imminent

¹ The ring symbolized the Bishop's marriage to his see; the crosier, or pastoral staff, his spiritual authority. Investiture with these put the Bishop in possession of the *spiritualities*, and homage in possession of the *temporalities* of his see.

² A Papal Bull of excommunication and deposition (compare §§ 134, 155, 328) in A.D. 1076 led to the Emperor's abject humiliation before Hildebrand at Canossa. The same Emperor in A.D. 1084 triumphantly set up in Rome a rival Pope, Clement III. (§ 105). In the same year Rome was mercilessly sacked by the Normans, as allies of Hildebrand. War went on for years between Pope and Antipope. In A.D. 1104 the Emperor's son rebelled, with the Pope's blessing, against his own father. In 1111 the same young Emperor, Henry V., came to Rome, and had the Pope and Cardinals at his mercy. In 1119 the tables were turned, and the Pope absolved the Emperor's subjects from their allegiance. The final compromise (Concordat of Worms, A.D. 1122) gave the Emperor right of investiture by the *sceptre* only. Compare below, § 109.

danger that the Church might, by a perversion of the Royal Supremacy, become the mere servant of the State, instead of what she ought always to be, and for so many centuries had already been, her ally and teacher and religious guide. Anselm also felt himself bound by the recent decree of a synod which he had attended at Rome. For these reasons he now declined in the case of the new King, Henry I., the homage to which he had readily submitted before in the case of William Rufus. It had become necessary to make it quite clear that the King had no power of giving to a Bishop his *spiritual* position and rights, but only of nominating from among the clergy one selected by him as fit to be consecrated to his high office by the Church, but not really a Bishop till so consecrated. It is most important even now to remember that the King (or Queen) cannot *make* a Bishop, but can only select out of the ranks of duly qualified clergy one who may then be *consecrated* by the solemn laying on of the hands of other consecrated Bishops, the office for which will be found at the end of our Prayer-Book. This is the constant and invariable practice of the Holy Catholic Church, to which we belong, and has been so from the very earliest times (compare § 65).

§ 108. *Resolute Attitude of Henry I.*—We can thus understand why Anselm resolved to make a firm stand in this matter against the new English Sovereign. But Englishmen generally were astonished and indignant that the National Archbishop should suddenly refuse to do homage to the National King, as hitherto, and that, too, at the bidding of the Pope of Rome! “*I will not lose,*” said Henry, “*the customs of my predecessors, nor will I endure in my kingdom one who is not my subject.*” So strong was the feeling that the English nobles and Bishops threatened to withdraw from the Roman see altogether rather than admit the decree.

§ 109. Resolute Attitude of Anselm. Final compromise.—But if Henry was stubborn, Anselm was stubborn too ; and he held out, supported with much hesitation by the Pope (who was loth to offend the powerful English King) for six long years, three of which he spent in voluntary exile¹ abroad at Lyons, the King meanwhile confiscating his revenues. The Church at home during his absence fell into great confusion and disorder. By the mediation of the King's sister a compromise was, with the Papal permission, at last effected in A.D. 1106,² to the great joy of the whole realm. Henry gave up the practice of investiture with ring and staff (§ 92), and also his right of choosing the Bishops,³ while still requiring their homage for the episcopal lands (§ 101). Thus the ancient principle that *spiritual power and rights are conferred by the Church only*, and not by the State, was vindicated and upheld, while at the same time a guarantee was left, by the exaction of homage, that the Bishops would be English subjects and loyal to the Crown. The importance of this was very great.

§ 110. Death of S. Anselm.—S. Anselm died a few years later, A.D. 1109. This noble and saintly prelate was one of the greatest of our Archbishops, and one of the most learned too. By his numerous philosophical and theological writings he laid the foundation of the later Scholasticism (below, § 128). And under the guidance of his overmastering personality the Church of England shook herself free from the imminent danger of undue subservience to the Throne.

¹ Anselm proceeded in person to Rome, at the King's request, in A.D. 1103, to confer with the Pope, and did not return till the settlement.

² In this very year the struggle abroad was renewed by the new Emperor Henry V. and Pope Paschal II.: see above, p. 90, n. 2. The Emperor became son-in-law of our Henry I. in A.D. 1114.

³ The elections were made henceforth, as now, by the Cathedral chapters, to which the King could signify his desire by a letter or message (Bishop Stubbs, "Const. Hist."³ vol. iii., p. 296). See § 161.

§ 111. *Clerical Celibacy.*—An essential part of Hildebrand's scheme of Church reform had been the entire abolition of clerical marriages (§ 97), and this he had ruthlessly and effectually carried through on the Continent. Hence in England also, after the Norman Conquest, the effort which had failed in the time of S. Dunstan (§ 84) was resumed by the two great Norman Archbishops, Lanfranc and Anselm; and clerical celibacy, though strongly opposed at the time, and constantly evaded afterwards,¹ became a recognized principle till the Reformation brought back the right of liberty in this matter (§ 284).

§ 112. *Ely Cathedral. Union of the Welsh and English Churches.*—Henry I. founded two new sees, at Ely (A.D. 1109) and Carlisle (A.D. 1133). Ely had hitherto belonged to the immense diocese of Lincoln; and just at the close of S. Anselm's life the arrangements were effected which, with the Pope's permission, transformed the beautiful Abbey church there (§ 103) into a Cathedral. Its first Bishop was Hervey, formerly Bishop of Bangor in WALES. And about this very time, in A.D. 1115, the ancient British Church of Wales, once the Church of the whole country (§ 2), accepted at length the Primacy of Canterbury, and became fully united with the Church of England, of which she has since formed, for now nearly eight hundred years, an inseparable part.² We have seen quite recently an organized attempt by the avowed enemies of the Church not merely to destroy this ancient union, which the lapse of centuries has only strengthened, but actually to strip this most ancient and venerable Church of

¹ Endless canons were passed on the subject. It is noteworthy that the one English Pope, Adrian IV. (§ 121), was himself the son of a clergyman. Gregory the Great (§ 26) was even the lineal descendant of a former Pope, Felix III. or IV.

² The two Churches had long been practically united. And there are instances of Welsh Bishops going to Canterbury for consecration as early as the ninth century.

Wales of the possessions bestowed upon her, by the piety of ages past, for God's service, while leaving the huge endowments of Dissent in the Principality *absolutely untouched*. The conscience of the nation was aroused : and the attempt ended in the total overthrow of the ministry which had ventured to make it.

§ 113. *Rome and England. Attempted intrusions foiled.*—S. Anselm, like the great prelates before him, had steadily resisted all attempts of Rome to intrude in England. Even during his struggle with Henry I. we find him opposing, as strongly as the King himself, the Papal attempt (A.D. 1101) to send into England a legate, the Archbishop of Vienne in France (himself afterwards a Pope). After S. Anselm's death the efforts from Rome were renewed. Pope Paschal II. sent in A.D. 1114 angry letters of complaint because of the persistent independence of the English Church : no appeals came from England, no questions were referred to Rome for decision ; the King held Councils and translated Bishops on his own initiative and without Papal authority. And the Pope proceeded to appoint a nephew and namesake of Anselm, the Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds, to be his *permanent* legate (§ 97) here ! This step caused immense excitement in England : the King was then abroad, in his Norman dominions ; and at the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the other Bishops, and the whole Royal Council, he forbade the Papal envoy to land in England. A second effort made by Pope Calixtus II. in A.D. 1121 had no better success ; for freedom in this respect was well known to be an ancient privilege (§ 105, end) of the Church of England.

§ 114. *John de Crema. Office of Legatus Natus.*—But the persistent efforts from Rome were at length crowned with success. Archbishop Ralph was succeeded by a less resolute Primate, William de Corbeuil, from whom the Pope exacted a special oath of

obedience at his visit for the pall (p. 26, n. 3);¹ and King Henry, who was now anxious to strengthen in every possible way his daughter Matilda's prospects of the Crown (his son having been drowned in A.D. 1120), permitted a Papal legate, John de Crema, to land in England, and to hold a great Council at Westminster (A.D. 1125), called, however, not in the legate's own name or in that of the Pope, but in that of the Archbishop of Canterbury. (Compare § 65.) This visit, and the haughty conduct of the foreigner, caused much indignant muttering among our forefathers, and especially his taking precedence of the Archbishop, as representative of the Pope. Men "saw in this," says the old Chronicler, "both an unusual novelty and the destruction of the ancient liberties of the kingdom of England." Shortly afterwards, partly, no doubt, to avoid a repetition of the scandal,² and partly to obtain undisputed precedence over the Archbishop of York,³ the Archbishop of Canterbury accepted the position of permanent Papal legate in Britain (A.D. 1126). At this point, then, begins the formal servitude of the Church of England to Rome, the office of "Legatus Natus" becoming from this time almost a permanent one, till abandoned, A.D. 1534, by Archbishop Cranmer.⁴ Through the Archbishop in his new capacity appeals to Rome became frequent (see below, § 121). As we enter this period of long dependence upon Rome, it must not be forgotten that the Church of England had already existed for hundreds and hundreds of

¹ See the "English Chronicle" under the year 1123.

² Only three subsequent cases of this foreign ecclesiastical interference occurred—one in the twelfth and two in the thirteenth century—till Wolsey's time. See Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. i., p. 239 n.

³ Ever since the Norman Conquest the York Archbishops (§ 70) had endeavoured to accentuate their independence of Canterbury, and to bring into operation the original scheme of S. Gregory (§ 30).

⁴ Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. i., p. 240. In A.D. 1221, Archbishop Langton obtained a Papal promise that only the Primate should have this legateship. He might be superseded, however, at any time by a "Legatus a latere," sent on a temporary mission by the Pope.

years, and had always been, as she is still, Catholic, and not "*Roman Catholic*," as those are called who have now broken from her communion (§ 328). Nor was there, even now, any loss of individuality in the English Church : and there were, as we shall see, continual efforts made by our ancestors to set bounds to the intrusion of Rome, and to revert to the older and better state of things, which, since the Reformation, we have again enjoyed.

§ 115. *The Carthusian and Cistercian Orders. S. Bernard.*—The gradual reform of the monasteries in the eleventh century, partly due to the revival of learning (p. 108, n. 1), and partly to the powerful impulse of Hildebrand, had borne fruit in the formation of numerous fresh orders. The most famous of these were the Carthusians, or monks of the "Grande Chartreuse" (near Grenoble), founded by S. Bruno of Cologne in A.D. 1084, and the still more renowned Cistercians, founded at Cistercium (Cîteaux) near Dijon by Robert of Molesmes in A.D. 1098, and by the Englishman, Stephen Harding, in A.D. 1119. To the Cistercians belonged the great S. Bernard, known as the "last of the Fathers," who in A.D. 1114 founded the daughter monastery of Clairvaux, and ruled there as Abbot till his death in 1153. Marvellous was the influence which S. Bernard wielded over his generation : for a quarter of a century he was "the real soul and director of the Papacy ; he guided the policy of Emperors and Kings, and swayed the deliberations of Councils."¹ To England the Cistercians came towards the end of Henry I.'s reign (A.D. 1128), and here as elsewhere they became the most popular of the monastic orders, and led the way in a sorely-needed religious revival. But wealth poured in upon them ; and with the wealth came that rapid degeneracy which was the common fate of *all* forms of monasticism, with the

¹ Canon Robertson, "Hist. of Chr. Church," vol. iii., p. 11.

honourable exception of the rigidly austere system of the Carthusians. Even in the newest foundations, when the first rush of enthusiasm was over, the high level of monastic life proved all but impossible to maintain. There is no rebuker of monastic degeneracy more severe than S. Bernard himself, whose witness, as a great champion of the Papacy, is peculiarly valuable.¹ The chief of the English Cistercian abbeys were those of Waverley, Rievaulx, Tintern, and Fountains.

§ 116. *Growth of freedom under Henry I.*—Under Henry I.'s firm and even-handed system of justice and finance,² the fusion of Normans and English (§ 107) went rapidly forward. Above all, the English towns-folk gradually and almost imperceptibly won back from their conquerors the full exercise of the im-memorial English privileges of *self-government, free speech, and trial by equals*, which, brought by the English from their German homes (§ 20), have always characterized our race all the world over, and contain the weighty secret of English freedom.³

§ 117. *Reign of Stephen. Feudal anarchy. Archbishop Theobald.*—The death of Henry I. became the signal for a wild outburst of Norman feudal anarchy, while the late King's daughter, Matilda (§ 114), and the Conqueror's grandson, Stephen, were contending as rivals for the throne. For nineteen years the Norman baronage, freed from the stern control of Henry, filled the land with rapine, outrage, and murder. In

¹ See his treatise addressed to Pope Eugenius III., "De Consideratione."

² This system was due to the skill of Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, the Justiciar (p. 111, n. 3). The important practice now began of sending out justices of the Supreme Court (the Curia Regis) on *circuit* through the country, sitting in the Shire-Moots (county courts), and thus linking them with the central administration.

³ J. R. Green, "Short History," pp. 92-97. At this time lived Geoffrey of Monmouth (Bishop of S. Asaph in A.D. 1152), the "Welsh Herodotus," who wove the traditions and legends of Brittany into his famous and immensely popular romance, the "Historia Britonum," which was long taken for serious history.

A.D. 1154 Archbishop Theobald, with the leading men on both sides, was able to end the universal misery by arranging the Peace of Wallingford ; according to which, on King Stephen's death shortly afterwards, Matilda's son, Henry Plantagenet,¹ ascended the throne of England as HENRY II.²

§ 118. *Vacarius at Oxford. The Decretal of Gratian.*

—The troubled Primacy of Theobald is especially memorable for two events, with both of which he was closely connected : the lectures, on civil law, by the Lombard professor Vacarius at Oxford, which mark the dawn of its reputation as a University (see below, § 129) ; and the introduction of the foreign canon law into England. The latter was due to the labours of Gratian, a monk of Bologna, who laboriously systematized the Roman canon law in or about A.D. 1151 (the exact date is doubtful). His "Decretum" was at once brought to England and was accepted by Theobald : and it became henceforth a text-book in the English ecclesiastical courts (compare § 102). The Forged Decretals (§ 79), being incorporated by Gratian in this compilation without hesitation, passed henceforth into unquestioned acceptance throughout the Western Church till the time of the Revival of Learning (§ 191).

¹ Matilda, widow of the Emperor Henry V. (p. 92, n. 2), had been married to Geoffrey Plantagenet, Count of Anjou, A.D. 1130.

² Compare p. 89, n. 2.

CHAPTER VII

FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY TO THE FIRST PART OF THE THIRTEENTH CEN- TURY. HENRY II. AND HIS SONS. THE STRUGGLE WITH ROME

"The Church of Rome is the most formidable combination that was ever formed against the authority and security of civil government, as well as against the liberty, reason, and happiness of mankind."—ADAM SMITH, *Wealth of Nations*, bk. v.

"The sixty years that followed Stephen's death have a special importance. . . . In the reigns of Henry II. and his sons we trace the interpenetration, the growing together, of the strong Anglo-Saxon local machinery [see p. 78, n. 2] and the strong Norman administrative system, the beginning of the process which is completed in national self-government, the concentration of all local and provincial machinery, the collective powers of the three estates of the realm, in the national parliament. . . . The systematic order of the growing polity was moulded by the Church and her clergy, and found models for its action in the Church system. The assizes and constitutions bear a strong resemblance to ecclesiastical canons, as the Karolingian capitularies had also done. The local and territorial divisions remained untouched in spite of feudal aggression, because the Church had adopted them in her archdeaconries, deaneries, and parishes. The assemblies of the clergy kept up forms that were easily transferred to the local moots. Representation by procurators or proxies with letters of credence or ratification empowering them to act on behalf of their constituents was familiar in Church councils, at home and in negotiation with the Holy See: and the early representatives in the National Council were frequently, if not always, invested with this character. Again, the system of writ and summons was ecclesiastical. What the Church had borrowed from the Empire it repaid with tenfold interest to the rising State system of Europe."—Summarized from BISHOP STUBBS, *Const. Hist.*, vol. i., pp. 445, 544, 632-637.

§ 119. *The Reign of Henry II. Legal reforms.*—We have now reached the second half of the twelfth century, and the very important reign of Henry II.

(A.D. 1154-89). The new King found disorder and anarchy rampant in the State (§ 117), and abuses rooted in the Church, which had crept in during the late troubles. His first task was to undo the evils of the long civil war, and bring back the settled government of his grandfather (§ 116). The castles of the lawless barons, which infested the land in all directions, were demolished, as centres of brigandage, by the firmness of the resolute young monarch, who was only twenty-one years old. Above all, he restored, and remodelled throughout, the administrative system of Henry I., which had been broken up by the twenty years of misrule. The system of courts and jurisdictions, as elaborated by him and defined and completed by Edward I. (§ 146), remains with slight modifications to our own day, binding together all parts of the country in a firm legal network of the highest value. At the commencement of his reforming work the King had the advantage of the vigorous and unswerving assistance of Thomas Becket, Theobald's youthful archdeacon at Canterbury, whom he had appointed Lord Chancellor¹ at his accession, and who quickly became his inseparable companion and most intimate counsellor.

§ 120. *Pope Adrian IV.* — Adrian IV. (Nicolas Breakspear), the only Englishman who has ever been made Pope, began his brief rule (A.D. 1154-9) in the very year of Henry II.'s accession. It was he who, at the instance of John of Salisbury (§ 129 below), granted to the English King, A.D. 1155, the nominal sovereignty of Ireland.² His own rule at Rome is memorable for the banishment and execution of Arnold of Brescia, under

¹ This important office dates from the reign of Edward the Confessor. The "Chancellor" was chief of the Royal notaries, and derived his name from the screen (*cancelli*) behind which they worked. As their chief, he was custodian of the Royal seal; and hence his importance.

² See J. R. Green, "Short History," p. 445. The Popes claimed a special lordship over *islands*, which they inferred from the forged "Donation of Constantine."

whose guidance a republic had been set up at Rome ; and for the subsequent quarrels with the Emperor Frederick I., which led to the *second* great struggle between the Papacy and the German Emperors. On the eve of the outbreak Adrian died, and there followed a Papal schism of twenty years, as some of the Cardinals elected an imperial, and some an anti-imperial Pope (see p. 103, n. 1).

§ 121. *Need of Church Reform. The "Benefit of Clergy."*—Having taken measures to set the State in order, Henry turned his attention to the Church, and at once found himself confronted with a crying abuse. It must be carefully borne in mind that the word "clergy" in mediæval times denoted not merely, as now, members of the three primitive orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons (§ 6), but also those who belonged to the five "minor orders" of sub-deacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, and doorkeepers,¹ and generally all who performed any office connected with the Church. During the recent disorders of Stephen's reign the practice known as "Benefit of Clergy" had been introduced from abroad. By this anyone belonging to the ranks of the "clergy" in this widest sense could claim to be tried for *any* offence or crime before the Church courts in place of the ordinary civil tribunals. The "benefit" of this to them was that the Church courts, being under much less severe laws (§ 102), and not possessing the power of condemning to death, the criminal might get off with a lenient fine or imprisonment, instead of a far severer punishment or the death sentence.² This right of exemption from the ordinary

¹ Compare Dean Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. vi., p. 192. The five minor orders, with others also, had grown up in the third century. See Bingham, "Antiq." i. 5, 7, and iii. *passim*.

² "The utmost penalties [of the Bishop's court] were flagellation, imprisonment, and degradation. . . . The enormity of the evil is acknowledged by Becket's most ardent partisans. . . . Becket himself had protected some notorious and heinous offenders."—MILMAN, *op. cit.*, vol. iii., pp. 344, 345. On the other hand, the extreme and merci-

tribunals had already led to scandals ; and Henry made up his mind that it must be reformed, and that with it also a stop must be put to the ever-increasing practice of appealing from the English courts to Rome (§ 114), which had been so carefully restricted by the Conqueror (§ 102). As a first step the King promoted his energetic minister and favourite, Becket (§ 119), to the Primacy, on the death of Theobald in A.D. 1161. The very strong reluctance of the apprehensive clergy was overborne ; and Thomas Becket was duly elected and consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in A.D. 1162. The new Archbishop raised the day of his consecration, the octave of Whit-Sunday, to the dignity of a high Festival as *Trinity Sunday*, the Festival which still so admirably crowns the doctrinal teaching of the Church's year.

§ 122. *Archbishop Becket and the King*.—But if Henry expected to obtain easily the Church reforms on which he had set his heart, he was wofully disappointed. For Becket instantly resigned the Chancellorship, and became as ardent and devoted in what he considered the cause and interest of the Church as he had hitherto been in that of the King : and from this time he found himself in continuous conflict with the Royal will. The first open quarrel arose over a small point of fiscal reform, an attempt by Henry to centralize the government further by making the sheriff's customary fee, which had hitherto been paid to each sheriff *locally* by the shire, a part of the *imperial* revenue.

§ 123. *The Constitutions of Clarendon*.—In spite of the attitude of his former Chancellor, Henry pushed resolutely forward his plans for Church reform, in which he was supported by his nobles, and not opposed

less severity of the ordinary penal laws at this time, and, indeed, till quite a recent period, must be remembered. The practical effect of the "Benefit of Clergy" was to withdraw the educated classes from their scope : and in this lay its great value. See Canon Jessop, "Coming of the Friars," etc., p. 80; Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. i., pp. 124-126.

by his other Bishops, nor even by the Pope, who at this time greatly needed his friendship and assistance against the Emperor.¹ The King's demand was that a clerk convicted by the Church court should be degraded, and then handed over to the secular court for punishment. This was resisted by Becket on the ground of the unfairness of a double punishment for the *same* offence. But Henry took his stand, as in civil matters (§ 119), on the customs in use in the reign of his grandfather, Henry I.² He had a document drawn up to embody these, which is known as the "Constitutions of Clarendon," from the place (Clarendon, near Salisbury) where it was presented to a great Council for ratification in A.D. 1164. The substance of its sixteen clauses (we vary their order for convenience sake) was as follows. The question of "Benefit of Clergy" was to be settled by giving the King's court the rights of preliminary inquiry, of sending an officer into the Church court to watch the case, and of claiming the offender, after conviction, for punishment. A definite succession of appellate Church courts was provided from the arch-deacon to the Bishop, and from him to the Archbishop, with a further appeal, in the last resort, to the King, to remit the case, if he saw reason, to the Archbishop's court for a second hearing, *no appeal to Rome* being allowed, except with the Royal consent (compare § 102). The higher clergy were not to leave the kingdom (*i.e.* to go to the Pope) without permission; and they were to give security, if called upon, not to do evil or mischief (viz., by the issue of *interdicts*

¹ Pope Alexander III. (A.D. 1159-81) was in the middle of his struggle with the rival Pope Victor IV. (A.D. 1159-64), who was supported by the Emperor, while Alexander was acknowledged by France and England, with the greater part of Western Christendom.

² It must be carefully observed that the "Benefit of Clergy" was a recent introduction into England during Stephen's reign (§ 121). Much mental confusion has arisen from mixing it up with the original establishment of the ecclesiastical courts by William the Conqueror (§§ 101, 102).

or *excommunications*, as was actually done presently by Becket) to the King or his kingdom during their absence. Churches might not be granted away (*i.e.* to monasteries)¹ without the King's permission. Various minor regulations² helped to settle the relations between the Church and civil courts, to insure their harmonious co-operation, and to remove abuses. In *contumacious cases* excommunication must not issue till application had been made to the King's officer to compel attendance. No chief baron or Royal officer might be excommunicated without previous application to the King (in person or by his deputy) to see right done. The rights and duties of barons of the realm were expressly assigned (compare § 101) to the Bishops and other ecclesiastical tenants in chief; and they were to sit in the King's court with the lay-barons, except when questions of blood arose. The income of their benefices during vacancy belonged to the King as overlord (compare § 104); they were to be elected, by the dignitaries of the vacant place, in the King's chapel, subject to his consent and that of his Council; and the Bishop elect was to do homage before consecration (see § 109). The last three clauses affirmed the King's right to the goods of outlawed felons, even though laid up in sanctuary; gave all pleas for *debts* to the King's court; and ordered that no serf should be ordained without his lord's permission (compare below, § 204).

§ 124. *Becket and the Constitutions. Flight from*

¹ See Appendix D, II. 3, p. 321.

² Excommunications were to be taken off as soon as possible after sentence; the trial of laymen was to be conducted in a formal and legal manner, and in the Bishop's presence; where offenders were too powerful for voluntary prosecutions, a jury of twelve was to be empanelled, to give evidence on oath; in disputes of tenure, the preliminary question, whether the tenure was clerical or lay, was to be settled by a jury of twelve, with the chief justice, and the case was to be taken to the court corresponding to their award; the King's court was to settle disputes concerning advowsons and presentations to benefices; in encountering violent resistance from powerful offenders, lay or clerical, each court was to have the aid of the other, according to need.

England.—Such was the comprehensive scheme which Henry laid before the Council of Clarendon. But the aim of Archbishop Becket (like that of Hildebrand, and his successors in the Papacy, in the struggles they carried on with the German Emperors), was to make and keep the Church entirely *independent of all State control* (§ 97). This Roman idea of a purely ecclesiastical despotism is refuted by the analogy of Old Testament times (see heading to Chapter IV.), and has never recommended itself to the English mind (see §§ 65, 92). Becket found himself alone in his opposition; and, under extreme pressure, at length reluctantly swore to observe the Constitutions. But, when everything was settled, he drew back again, and refused to set his seal to them. After a series of annoyances and humiliations, inflicted upon him by the indignant King and nobles, he was cited to appear, on charges of *peculation and treason*, before a Council at Northampton, where he confronted his enemies undauntedly in the Council chamber itself, and solemnly *appealed to the Pope*. He then fled secretly, under cover of night, from the town; and eventually effected his escape across the Channel to Sens in France, where the Pope was residing. There he was received with the utmost sympathy and respect, and went so far as to resign the ring of his Archbishopsric into the Pope's hands, and to receive it again as a gift *from him*. Henry's wrath was terrible: but the Archbishop was out of his power, and took care to remain so.

§ 125. *Albigensians in England.*—The Continent was at this time seething with heretical sects, partly on account of the avarice and oppression of the ecclesiastical system now centred in Rome, but chiefly as the result of the greater independence and freedom of thought and the novel ideas imported from the East through the Crusades, and especially prevalent in the mercantile towns. The views of these sectaries—known as Cathari, Publicani, or Bonshommes, and after-

wards as the *Albigenses*, from their chief centre at Albi in the south of France—seem to have been a curious amalgam of old Manichean and Gnostic heresies, which had floated down from a long-distant past (§§ 7, 15), and were now revived and stimulated by the renewal of contact with the East.¹ In A.D. 1166 a small party of these foreigners appeared in England. The treatment meted out to them was cruelly prompt and decisive: after condemnation by a Council, they were by the King's orders branded, scourged, and then driven out to perish of cold and hunger.² England remained entirely free from the religious disorders and dissensions of the Continent, till the rise of the Lollards (§ 176) two centuries later.³

§ 126. *Murder of Archbishop Becket.*—For six years (A.D. 1164-70) Becket remained in exile, fulminating excommunications against all who upheld the Constitutions of Clarendon. The amount of support which the Pope ventured to give him varied according as his own fortunes in his conflict with the Emperor and Antipope (p. 103, n. 1) rose and fell.⁴ In A.D. 1167 came the twin disasters which drove the Emperor in flight from Italy—the pestilence at Rome, and the revolt of Lombardy: and in A.D. 1170 Henry, dreading the twofold menace of an interdict (compare below, § 134) and a war with France, suddenly gave way, and a reconciliation

¹ On their connection with the Paulicians, the seventh-century Manichean sect of Armenia, which was established in Thrace in the tenth century, see "Student's Ecc. Hist." vol. ii., pp. 578 ff.; and for an account of their strange tenets, *ib.*, pp. 591-594.

² The views of S. Bernard (§ 115 above), and of Wazo, Bishop of Liège in the preceding century, against capital punishment for heresy were far in advance of the general inhumanity of the age.

³ The Lollards, however, were, as we shall see, not exponents of old and exploded heresies, like the *Albigenses*, but advocates of Scriptural reforms, and find their prototype rather in the *Waldenses*, who, founded in A.D. 1170 by a merchant of Lyons, named Waldo, were, even by their enemies' confession, free from heretical taint, and were utterly distinct from the *Albigenses*, with whom they are, however, often confused.

⁴ See Dean Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. iii., p. 321.

with his recalcitrant Archbishop was effected at Fretteville. Becket well understood his dangerous position, and said to the Bishop of Paris, "I go to England to die." He landed on December 1st, 1170, and was received enthusiastically by the populace. But unhappily he had sent before him, as Papal legate, letters, suspending the Archbishop of York and eight English Bishops, and excommunicating three of them, his chief opponents! He acted, indeed, at this time with an absolutely reckless disregard of consequences, which can only be explained by his expressed desire for martyrdom. Henry was abroad at the time, and on hearing of the bold step, was provoked to the hasty exclamation, "*Will no one rid me of this turbulent priest?*" Four knights hurried over sea to Canterbury, and there consummated the foul murder within the sacred walls of the Cathedral itself (December 29th).

§ 127. *S. Thomas of Canterbury.*—The consequences of this atrocious deed, the news of which filled Christendom with horror, were immense. Henry II. was forced to a humiliating submission to the Pope; and what Becket had failed in his lifetime to obtain, the tragic circumstances of his death procured: *the Constitutions of Clarendon were renounced.* Three years later he was canonized as a saint and a martyr by the Pope;¹ and in the same year Henry was confronted by an organized revolt of English nobles,² aided by Scotland and Flanders, an invasion of Normandy by the French, and a rebellion of his own sons. Returning to England, he underwent an elaborate public penance in the Cathedral (A.D. 1174): the bulk of the nation rallied faithfully round him: and the rebellion speedily collapsed.

§ 128. *New Intellectual Life. The Schoolmen.*—The

¹ Pope Alexander III. had just taken into his own hands, by a decree in 1170, the right of canonization, hitherto inherent in all Bishops.

² This was the last effort of the feudal baronage in England against the Royal power. Compare §§ 117, 119.

immediate effect of the First Crusade (§ 106) following upon the stir of intellectual life in the eleventh century¹ was to give an extraordinary impetus to the desire for knowledge. "The long mental inactivity of feudal Europe broke up like ice before a summer's sun": and Lanfranc and Anselm, with others in the eleventh century, were but the forerunners of a host of enthusiastic scholars and students in the twelfth. During four eventful centuries—the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth—the "Schoolmen," as they are termed, spent themselves, and exhausted all the resources of the most elaborate dialectic skill, in discussing and explaining the *how* and *why* of Catholic theology, and the most abstruse problems connected with everything in heaven and earth. The mental gymnastics of the Schoolmen elaborately trained and prepared the human mind, on lines of the strictest orthodoxy,² for the great burst of intellectual freedom which was to come hereafter at the Renaissance (§ 191). The writings of the Schoolmen in some respects may be said to correspond to the *schoolboy exercises* upon which the mature man looks back with something like disdain, but which have ripened his immature powers, and made him what he is.³

§ 129. *Rise of the Universities.*—In closest connection with the stir and bustle of this intellectual life came the gradual development of favoured schools into Universities, *i.e.* educational corporations with a recognized position and definite privileges, a development in which the University of Paris led the way, and which was mainly completed during the second

¹ The Emperor Henry III. (§ 97) was a noted patron of learning.

² The Church was powerful enough to check every effort made (as by Peter Abelard, A.D. 1079-1142) in the direction of free and unfettered speculation, and to keep the Schoolmen within the limits of her own rigid system, which, therefore, with all the accretions upon it which the lapse of ages had produced, was entirely accepted, and painfully justified by the Schoolmen.

³ See "Student's Ecc. Hist." vol. ii., pp. 453-456.

half of this twelfth century. Three English scholars, renowned both abroad and at home, were Robert Pulleyn, who lectured at Paris and Oxford, became a Cardinal, and died about the middle of the century; John of Salisbury (§ 120), the faithful friend of Becket, and a master of the Latin classics; and Robert, Bishop of Hereford (generally called Robert of Mélun). The fame of Oxford as a home of learning dates from the lectures of Vacarius there in Stephen's reign (§ 118).¹ Robert Pulleyn of England, and the yet more famous Peter Lombard, the "Master of Sentences" († A.D. 1164), were the earliest to systematize theology in the form of sentences (*sententiae*), i.e. a series of propositions, collected from the Fathers and other authorities, and arranged so as to illustrate the whole range of theology.² And, as theology was systematized in this century by the "Masters of Sentences," so was the canon law, as we have already seen (§ 118), by the labours of Gratian. The schools of Oxford are first termed a University in a charter of A.D. 1201, and those of Cambridge in A.D. 1223: but Gerald of Wales, about A.D. 1185 already speaks of Oxford as "the place most distinguished in England for the excellence of its clerks"; and its fame began, as we have just noted, still earlier.³

§ 130. *Results of Becket's death. Close of Henry II.'s*

¹ The lectures of William of Champeaux and Abelard at Paris, which first developed the Cathedral school there into the University, as it afterwards became, date from the very first years of the century. The development of the ancient school at Cambridge seems to have begun in A.D. 1109. See Fuller, "Hist. of Camb." i. 8.

² The Sentences of Peter Lombard became the recognized text-book of the scholastic theology for three centuries. The study of these dry collections superseded almost entirely the study of Holy Scripture till the Reformation (§ 193).

³ In these paragraphs, and throughout, when dealing with foreign Church history (so closely interwoven at this period with that of England), I am very greatly indebted to the "Student's Ecclesiastical History," by Mr. Philip Smith (Murray), a convenient summary, with copious extracts from larger works.

reign.—The late Archbishop's struggle with the Crown had been waged on the highest hierarchical grounds, to make and keep the clergy a separate caste, entirely independent of the ordinary tribunals (§ 124). But his dauntless opposition to the Royal will, which few then opposed, and, above all, his pitiful and tragic end had awed and impressed the popular imagination ; he was universally looked upon as a martyr in the cause of Holy Church ; and the whole nation "gave itself up madly to the worship of St. Thomas." His shrine in Canterbury Cathedral became one of the most famous in Christendom ; and from the continual offerings of numberless pilgrims it was the richest in the world, till rifled and destroyed by Henry VIII. in A.D. 1534 (§ 258). The Pope, who had now triumphed over all his enemies,¹ naturally took advantage of Henry II.'s embarrassed position ;² and the King, while continuing to perfect the legal machinery of the country (§ 119), found himself obliged to let ecclesiastical matters drift into almost complete anarchy. On the Royal side were the Bishops of the National Church, who had only faintly supported Becket, and were averse to the encroachments of Rome : on the other side, the Pope found his support, as usual, in the monks (see § 242). Becket's successor, Richard, died in the year 1184 ; and the next Primate, Baldwin, "one of the most distinguished scholars of his time," made a resolute attempt to abate the insolence of the unruly and luxurious monks of Canterbury in a struggle which lasted for years, and

¹ He received the abject submission of the German Emperor, Frederick I. (Barbarossa), (see § 120) at Venice, A.D. 1177. In 1179 the right of electing future Popes was vested *exclusively* in the College of Cardinals (compare § 97). The rules for the Conclave (locking up the Cardinals till their election is made) were laid down in 1274 ; but even they entirely failed to put an end to the ambitious bickerings of the Cardinals at every election to the Papacy.

² We find the Pope soon beginning to claim a right of *confirming* the appointment of English Bishops (§ 134).

excited great interest abroad. Their long disputation was interrupted (A.D. 1187) by the painful news that Jerusalem had been captured by the Mohammedan Sultan of Egypt, Saleh-ed-Deen or Saladin (compare § 106). Two years later came the death of Henry II., the accession of his son, Richard I., and the departure of Archbishop Baldwin and the new King of England himself to the Holy Land, on the Third Crusade (A.D. 1189-92).¹

§ 131. *Reign of Richard I. S. Hugh of Lincoln.*—The short reign of Richard I. (A.D. 1189-99) was a period of much disorder and confusion, the King being for a considerable time entirely absent from the country, fighting gallantly against the Mohammedans in the Third Crusade,² and then, as a caged lion, chafing in the dungeons of Germany. The government was mainly in the hands of two able prelates, William Longchamp, Bishop of Ely, who after a time fell by the intrigues of Prince John in A.D. 1191, and Hubert Walter, Bishop of Salisbury, a distinguished Crusader, who became Archbishop of Canterbury in A.D. 1193, and Justiciar the following year. Each of these, by combining the offices of Justiciar³ and Papal legate, ruled supreme in State and Church. Among the prelates of this uneasy time stands out the figure of the saintly

¹ The Second Crusade (A.D. 1147-9) had been preached by S. Bernard (§ 115). With an immense waste of life, it had effected no permanent result, chiefly owing to the hostility of Constantinople. For the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Crusades, see below, § 145 and n. 1.

² The memorable siege and capture of Acre (A.D. 1189-91) was followed by a vain effort to reach Jerusalem; and a treaty was made with Saladin in A.D. 1192. The aged Emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, on the eve of another rupture with the Pope, was drowned while crossing a river on his way to the Holy Land in 1190.

³ The Justiciar, originally the Regent of the realm during the King's temporary absences abroad, became, from the time of Ranulf Flambard under William Rufus (§ 104), a permanent official, the chief minister of the Norman Kings. The office was originally held by clerics, to avert the danger of its becoming hereditary (Bishop Stubbs, "Const. Hist." vol. i., pp. 346-351).

and dauntless Hugh of Avalon, still commemorated in our kalendar on November 17th.¹ He was specially selected by Henry II. in A.D. 1181 to be prior of his monastery at Witham—the first *Carthusian* (§ 115) monastery in England—and five years later to be Bishop of the immense diocese of Lincoln (§ 142), which he sternly and effectually reorganized. He was distinguished for munificence, for personal holiness, and for the utter fearlessness with which he stood before Kings and defended the right. He was canonized in A.D. 1220, twenty years after his death ; and sixty years later the lovely *Angel Choir*, specially added to Lincoln Cathedral for the purpose, received his remains.

§ 132. Accession of King John. Innocent the Third.—In A.D. 1199 came the accession of Richard's younger brother, the turbulent John, under whom, at the hands of the most arrogant and successful of all the Popes, England was destined to receive her greatest national humiliation. It is not a little remarkable that the rule of the most powerful Pope that has ever lived, and of the most wicked and worthless monarch that has ever reigned in England, should have so nearly coincided in point of time. Innocent III., at the extraordinarily early age of thirty-seven, became Pope in A.D. 1198 ; John, the youngest son of Henry II., King of England in 1199 ; and both Pope and King died in 1216, after very different careers.

§ 133. Enormous powers of the Papacy. Additions to the Faith.—Under Innocent III. the Church of Rome rose for a short time to the highest point of power she has ever reached. The Popes had waded to that proud pre-eminence through rivers of Christian blood (§ 107) : but Innocent III. now reaped where his predecessors, and especially Hildebrand (§ 97), had sown. He interfered authoritatively in Portugal, Spain,²

¹ See Appendix P, p. 360.

² Portugal, and one of the kingdoms of Spain (Aragon), became in his time, like England, vassals of the Papal see.

Hungary, Poland, Norway, Scotland, and Bulgaria : and even Iceland and Armenia were not beyond his reach. It was he who disallowed (at Metz) the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular ; who enunciated the principle upon which Rome has so often acted, that *no faith must be kept with heretics* ;¹ and who devoted himself to the task of trampling out heresy by force, and in particular set on foot the terrible persecution and wholesale massacre known as the *Albigensian Crusade* (p. 114, n. 2), which filled the southern provinces of France with blood and fire. It was Innocent III. who, at the Fourth Lateran Council in A.D. 1215 (the year before he died), made² *Transubstantiation*³ a formal part of the Roman belief, and imposed on all the necessity of *Auricular Confession*.⁴ (For his institution of the Mendicant Friars, see below, § 140.) In his contests with the Kings of France and England this great Pope put forth all his power : and for the time he was successful with both. It is his contest with England at which we have now to glance.

§ 134. *Struggle between King John and the Pope*.—After Becket's murder the Popes had begun to claim a right of *confirming* the election of the Archbishops, after their election in England, and this had been acquiesced in by Henry II. (§ 130). But in the year 1206 Innocent III.⁵ took a very unexpected step indeed, going much further than this. Taking advantage of a disputed election, he calmly set aside altogether the Bishop of Norwich, whom King John

¹ “Qui Deo fidem non servat, fides servanda non est.”—*Ep. xi. 26.* Compare § 184.

² Innocent III. was the first Pope who issued the decrees of Councils in *his own name*, making their part merely that of *approvers*. Contrast § 13.

³ See p. 327, n. 1, and Index, s. v.

⁴ See below, § 284.

⁵ For his previous interference with Archbishop Hubert Walter, in A.D. 1198, and the wrath of Richard I., see Archdeacon Perry's “Student's Eng. Ch. Hist.” vol. i., p. 283, a work to which these pages are under constant obligations.

had appointed Archbishop, and sent to Rome for approval, and in his stead chose one of his own Cardinals, Stephen Langton, an Englishman of great learning and ability; forced the deputation of Canterbury monks at Rome to elect him; consecrated him with his own hands (A.D. 1207); and sent him to England as Archbishop. This most arrogant step naturally evoked great indignation: the news stung King John, a man of violent passions, to a frenzy of unbounded rage; he harried the Canterbury monks out of the kingdom, and forbade Stephen Langton to land. A long and bitter struggle thus began between King and Pope. In A.D. 1208 the Pope placed England under an interdict—his favourite weapon of offence¹—ordering the clergy to cease their sacred duties and close the churches. John retaliated by confiscating the benefices of all Bishops and clergy who obeyed the Papal mandate and observed the interdict. The Pope proceeded (A.D. 1209) to *excommunicate* the King, although no one could be found in England sufficiently bold to publish the sentence. Finally, in A.D. 1212, the Pope pronounced sentence of *deposition* against John, proclaimed a general crusade² against him, absolved his subjects from their allegiance, and offered the English crown to Philip of France!³ There is no doubt that

¹ It had been successfully used in Innocent's contest with France shortly before.

² This was also an effective weapon in the Papal armoury. During these very years began the horrible atrocities of the Albigensian Crusade (above, § 133), proclaimed by Innocent against the rich and flourishing province of Languedoc in Southern France, which was then almost wholly in the hands of the sectaries (§ 125). The struggle lasted for twenty years (A.D. 1209-29), was conducted with the most revolting and relentless cruelty throughout, and ended in the terrible heresy-hunting decrees of the Council of Toulouse (A.D. 1229), out of which blossomed the Inquisition (p. 121, n. 3).

³ The remarkable parallel of A.D. 1570 should not pass unnoticed: see below, § 328. Compare also p. 90, n. 2; and the first heading to this chapter. Rome has never abandoned even yet a single one of her pretensions to secular power (§ 97), which, as matters stand, may be revived at any moment in full vigour (§ 154).

John could have treated this also with contempt, had he still had the nation with him. But unfortunately, by long-continued cruelty and by unbridled lust, he had irrevocably alienated his whole people: it came to his knowledge that the country was honeycombed with disaffection towards him and detestation of his tyranny: and, having turned vainly for help, it is said, even to the Mohammedans of Spain (p. 71, n. 4),¹ he found at last that his only chance of safety lay in reconciling the Pope to himself, and then by his help crushing down the movement for liberty among his subjects. In this unscrupulous and subtle policy he was nearly successful: but his plans were destined to be most unexpectedly thwarted and overthrown by the efforts of none other than Archbishop Langton himself, who now came nobly forward to save the liberties of his country.

§ 135. *Submission of King John to the Papacy.*—Whatever King John did, he did thoroughly. Having made up his mind to seek refuge from the rising tide of his people's indignation in an alliance with the Pope, he lost no time in making that alliance firm. The terms were hard: he had not only to receive Archbishop Langton and make full restitution for his plunder of Church property—that was a matter of course—but he had also to publicly yield up his *kingdom* to the Pope, receiving it back from him as henceforth his *vassal* (compare § 97 and p. 112, n. 2), to swear fidelity and promise homage to him for himself and his successors, and to pay him yearly a fixed sum of money² in token of subjection! To all this King John agreed; and by placing himself in this position he craftily obtained the powerful protection of the Pope, as now his feudal *overlord*, against all enemies, foreign and domestic. It was on the Eve of Ascension

¹ So the chronicler Matthew Paris (see p. 120 below) expressly asserts.

² A thousand marks (seven hundred for England, three hundred for Ireland), independently of "Peter's Pence" (§ 98). The mark was 13*s. 4d.*

Day,¹ May 15th, A.D. 1213, that he thus shamed and humiliated the country of which he was Sovereign : and in the reign of his young son, as we shall see, England had to drink to the bitter dregs the results of her King's unscrupulous policy. Yet good came out of the evil : from that time of humiliation slowly but surely a reaction against Rome and Rome's domination set in, which can be traced step by step till it ended in the restoration of the ancient liberties of Church and Realm, which had been to so large an extent impaired since the Norman Conquest.

§ 136. *Archbishop Langton. The Great Charter.*—It was at this most critical moment of English history that John's tyranny, which he might now hope, with his new alliance with the Papacy, would carry everything before it, met with a quite unexpected obstacle. Stephen Langton proved to be as wise and patriotic an Archbishop as John was an unwise and ignoble monarch, and once more, as often in our history, an Archbishop dared to confront a King, and the National Church proved herself the guardian of National liberty. Bishops and clergy with barons and people met together in a great Council at S. Paul's Cathedral ; and there the Archbishop produced and read the charter in which Henry I., at his accession a century before (§ 107), had granted back to the English nation its old laws and customs—embodied in the so-called “Laws of Edward the Confessor”—which had been to a large extent forfeited at the Norman Conquest.² On

¹ The prophecy, thus strangely fulfilled, of a hermit, Peter of Wakefield, that “before Ascension Day [the anniversary of his coronation] John would cease to be King,” had greatly impressed the tyrant’s mind with superstitious dread.

² This charter had been referred to by the Justiciar Fitz-Peter at the important *representative* Council of S. Albans, held primarily to assess the amount of restitution due from John to the Church, and attended accordingly not only by the Bishops and barons, but by the reeve and four legal men of each township on the Royal demesne. The Justiciar, however, died shortly afterwards, to John’s great relief. Then the Archbishop came forward with a copy of the actual charter.

the basis of that old charter was now drawn up the most famous of English documents, which has ever since been regarded as the essential foundation of our English liberty,¹ MAGNA CARTA, the “Great Charter,” the opening clause of which is “THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND SHALL BE FREE,”²—the Church of *England*, not the Church of Rome!

§ 137. *The Pope and the Charter. Close of the Reign.*—The baffled tyrant reluctantly and with unconcealed fury and resentment signed at Runnymede, and swore to observe, the Great Charter (June 15th, 1215).³ The Pope, when the news reached him, was transported with rage against Langton and the barons, and hastened to absolve John from his solemn oaths, and to annul the Charter! Then followed an awful year, during which the King with a band of foreign mercenaries went up and down England like a madman, ravaging, torturing, and slaughtering. The Pope suspended Langton for refusing to publish his sentence of excommunication against the barons, who on their side sought aid from France, and offered the crown to the French King’s eldest son. The knot of perplexing difficulties was suddenly and summarily cut by the death of the English King (October, A.D. 1216): the Pope had died three months before him. A boy of nine now succeeded to the English throne as HENRY III.

¹ “The whole of the constitutional history of England is little more than a commentary on Magna Carta.”—BISHOP STUBBS, vol. i., p. 532.

² “Imprimis concessimus Deo, et hac præsenti carta nostra confirmavimus pro nobis et hæredibus nostris in perpetuum, quod ECCLESIA ANGLICANA LIBERA SIT, et habeat jura sua integra, et libertates suas illæsus.”—*Magna Carta, init.*

³ Among the twenty-five barons chosen to carry out the Charter appears the *Mayor of London*, whose office had first come into being in the preceding reign (A.D. 1191).

CHAPTER VIII

THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY (CONTINUED). ENGLAND IN SUBJECTION TO ROME. GROWTH OF THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION

“Tu regere imperio populos, ROMANE, memento ;
Hæ tibi erunt artes ; pacisque imponere morem,
Parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos.”

VERGIL, *Aen.* vi. 852-854.

“The completion and definition of the system of the Three Estates : the completion of the representative system as based on the local institutions and divisions, and as made possible by Edward’s policy of placing the whole administration in direct relation with the crown : the clear definition of functions, powers, and spheres of action in church and state, in court and council, in parliament and convocation, in legislature and judicature ;—these are the work of the [thirteenth] century.”—BISHOP STUBBS, *Const. Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 5.

§ 138. *Reign of Henry III. Period of Subjection to Rome.*—Henry III.’s reign of fifty-six years (A.D. 1216-72) is one of the longest in English history, and one of the most important also. It opened in gloom and humiliation. For now Church and Nation found themselves quite prostrate for a time before the power of Rome. The new King, only nine years old, had to do homage to the Pope as his feudal overlord (§ 135) ; and the clergy were very heavily fined by a Papal legate for their support of liberty in the recent struggle against King John. But the Great Charter, the fruit of that struggle, remained ; it was at once formally ratified by William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, who, as regent for the boy-King, now rallied English-

men round him, and, with the energetic help of the Papal legate in England, soon succeeded in ending the civil war and restoring peace to the distracted country.

§ 139. *Papal Extortions. The Clergy fleeced. S. Edmund of Abingdon.*—But before long there fell upon our country a series of Papal extortions of the most unparalleled and extraordinary kind, the bitter result of John's unauthorized submission to Rome. Pope Gregory IX. (A.D. 1227-41) was in sore need of money, for he was just plunging into his scandalous struggle with Frederick II., Emperor of Germany and King of Sicily, the "Wonder of the World," and the "Hammer of the Roman Church."¹ From wealthy England, therefore, and for this unpopular object,² he began, as soon as Archbishop Langton was dead (A.D. 1228), to wring, on one pretext or another, immense sums. The clergy in particular, having both King and Pope against them, were mercilessly fleeced. Besides the extortion of heavy subsidies, the baneful system began of Papal "provisions" and "reservations" of benefices,³ which was extended also to sees in Edward II.'s reign (§ 157), and was forbidden altogether in that of Edward III. by the Statute of Provisors (§ 161). Thus foreigners were constantly being intruded

¹ This famous Emperor, son of Henry VI. of Germany (A.D. 1190-7) and grandson of Frederick I. (Barbarossa), ruled from A.D. 1212 to 1250. His expedition to the Holy Land took place, when under excommunication, in 1228-9. He was excommunicated twice by Gregory IX., from 1227 to 1230, and in 1239; and a third time in 1245 by the haughty Innocent IV., with whom he carried on implacable warfare till his own death in 1250. With him ended the *third* great struggle between the Papacy and the Empire (see §§ 97, 107, 120), which shivered the latter to fragments, and brought the former, before long, under the domination of France (below, § 154). The Empire was resuscitated by the election, under Papal auspices, of Rudolf, Count of Hapsburg, in 1273.

² The Emperor married the King of England's sister in 1235.

³ Innocent III. had already advanced a claim to dispose of all the benefices of Christendom (Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. vi., p. 65, n. 3).

into English benefices, to the great grievance of the true patrons, so as to squeeze them dry for the Pope. The patience of Englishmen has its limits ; and at length secret rioting broke out all over the country against the detested Roman strangers. In A.D. 1233 Edmund Rich (S. Edmund of Abingdon), a famous Oxford tutor and then Canon of Salisbury, became Archbishop of Canterbury. Though nominated and forced upon England by the Pope, he did his best to follow in the steps of Stephen Langton, and proved an excellent and devoted Primate. But all his efforts were useless, and at last, as Matthew Paris tells us—the great chronicler who lived at this time (A.D. 1200-59) and has left us a vivid contemporary picture of the reign—“*seeing the Church of England to be day by day more trodden under foot, robbed of her possessions, despoiled of her liberties, life became insupportable to him, and he could not endure to see the evils which were upon the land.*” He retired to Becket’s former place of residence in exile, Pontigny in France, and died broken-hearted at Soissi shortly afterwards (A.D. 1240). His work in England was taken up by men of sterner mould than the gentle and saintly Archbishop—by Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, and by Simon de Montfort, the great head of the patriot party, which during these long years of foreign favouritism and weak misgovernment gradually grew up with the stern determination to chase the foreigners from England, and to set matters straight in Realm and Church. What they did, and how they did it, we shall see directly.

§ 140. *The Coming of the Friars.*—The early years of this long reign had seen the arrival in England of the Mendicant Friars, *i.e.* “Begging Brethren,” two quite new orders founded in A.D. 1212 and 1215 by S. Francis of Assisi and the Spaniard S. Dominic respectively, and destined for a world-wide work of religious revival, at a time when the end of the world

was again (§ 89) supposed to be rapidly approaching,¹ and every kind of wickedness seemed rampant.² The gentle S. Francis proposed, in a spirit of exalted and holy enthusiasm, to convert the world by poverty and humility, by love and tendance of the sick and suffering everywhere, and especially of the lepers, and by conduct modelled entirely on our Saviour's precepts to His early disciples. The members of his order took the three strict vows of *chastity, poverty, and obedience*. Their apparel was merely a coarse gray tunic girt with a cord. They went barefoot and bareheaded. They renounced all earthly prospects and all luxuries and comforts, and lived solely on the chance alms of the charitable. Unlike the monks, who had shut themselves away from the wickedness of the world, they went straight to the neglected masses of the people in the festering slums that clustered round the great towns, and by works of tenderness, charity, and pity strove to awaken them to a better life. The movement spread like wildfire over the Continent, together with the similar one of S. Dominic, the stern opposer of heresy, who about the same time founded the rival order of Preaching Friars³ (*Fratres Prædicatores*), known in England, from their black mantle and cowl, as *Black Friars*, as the Fran-

¹ The prophecies of Abbot Joachim of Fiore, who died in A.D. 1202, put the end of the world in 1260 (compare Rev. xii. 6, etc.) and obtained very wide fame and credence. The "two witnesses" of Rev. xiv. 6 were presently identified with the Franciscan and Dominican Orders. The fondness for apocalyptic study comes out in the contest between Gregory IX. and Frederick II. (p. 119, n. 1), who are known to each other as the *great red dragon* and the *beast with seven heads and ten horns* respectively!

² For the state of things in England, see J. R. Green, "Short History," p. 148.

³ The Dominicans or Preaching Friars aimed at turning the great weapon of all the sectaries (§ 125), public and private *preaching*, against themselves. To the Dominicans was intrusted the management of the newly-invented *Inquisition* (see p. 114, n. 2) by Gregory IX., which was established in Spain in A.D. 1232, and in Languedoc and Lombardy the following year. See also below, p. 158, n. 1, 260, n. 2.

ciscans (*Fratres Minores*) were, from their gray tunics, known as *Grey Friars*, and the Carmelites (originally a colony of hermits on Mount Carmel, who came to Europe in A.D. 1238) were known as *White Friars*.¹ Dominicans came to England in A.D. 1219, Franciscans first in 1224; and their popularity and the influence they enjoyed it is hardly possible to exaggerate. But, alas, too soon they left their first love; their early zeal cooled; and their vows were evaded. Wealth flowed in upon them; and as they rapidly degenerated (compare § 115), they became at last one of the most mischievous influences of the age. Their devotion to money-getting by any and every means brought the friars into almost universal scorn and contempt; while, by intruding themselves into every parish at their pleasure, they brought to naught Church discipline, and did their best to destroy the parochial system, acting in entire independence of the Bishops, and owning no authority except the Pope's.²

§ 141. *The Universities and the Schoolmen*.—But in their earlier and better days, the friars were received with the utmost enthusiasm by all classes alike, and brought about a great and sorely-needed religious revival, linking themselves to the mass of the people especially by the remarkable institution of *Tertiaries*, i.e. layfolk free from the vows, but living a regulated life in sympathy with the order, and bound to render it every possible assistance. They soon established schools of their own at Oxford, which, like Paris also and Cambridge, had been gradually rising into fame as a University in the preceding century (§ 129), and was now celebrated all over Europe. The whole of

¹ The fourth and least noted order, of Augustinian (Austin) Friars, was founded in A.D. 1256. To it the famous Martin Luther (§ 200) belonged. The London monastery of the *White Friars* was founded in 1245, and of the *Black Friars* in 1276.

² Canon Robertson, vol. iii., p. 590. Chaucer (see below, § 167) in his "Sompnours Tale" gives with his usual good-humoured sarcasm a vivid picture of the friar upon his rounds.

this thirteenth century was a period of profound learning—the era of the most famous of the Schoolmen (§ 128). The great Englishman, Alexander of Hales,¹ Archdeacon of Paris, who died A.D. 1245, was a Franciscan; Albert the Great, his contemporary (A.D. 1193-1280), was a Dominican;² while later in the century flourished also the eloquent and gentle Franciscan, S. Bonaventura (A.D. 1221-74), whose phrase "*sweetness and light*" has been caught up in our own day by Matthew Arnold; the Dominican S. Thomas Aquinas (A.D. 1226-74), whose marvellous "Summary of Theology" was "for centuries the instrument of training the intellect of Europe," and is still the standard of orthodoxy in the Church of Rome (unfortunately, though a profound student of Scripture, he was entirely unacquainted with Greek and Hebrew);³ and in England our most famous countryman, the Franciscan Roger Bacon, at Oxford (A.D. 1214-92)—all three men of stupendous abilities, giants in intellect, and crammed with all the knowledge possible in their age, stimulated by the recent discovery of the philosophical writings of ARISTOTLE.⁴

§ 142. *Bishop Grosseteste and the Pope.*—The saintly Primate, Edmund Rich, had passed away in A.D. 1240, powerless to save the Church he loved so well from the relentless grip of Rome (§ 139). But seven years

¹ Surnamed from the place in Gloucestershire where, probably, he was born.

² He is of immense importance as the first who unlocked and made public the vast treasures of antiquity stored up in the Aristotelian literature (see n. 4 below) and also as the preceptor of S. Thomas Aquinas.

³ This cardinal defect of the Schoolmen, which itself largely vitiates their labours (compare also p. 108, n. 2), is pointed out by Roger Bacon himself in his "Compendium Studii Theologice" (A.D. 1292).

⁴ Aristotle had hitherto been known exclusively as the master-teacher of *logic* and dialectics. His *philosophy*—the Physics and Metaphysics, the Morals, and the Natural History—became slowly known in this century, first from Arabic translations and then from the original Greek. As soon as known, they began to exert an immense influence in the development of systematic theology, as the philosophic foundation on

later, another great Englishman, Robert Grosseteste, Bishop since A.D. 1235 of the huge diocese of Lincoln (which then included the present sees of Peterborough and Oxford, and part of Ely), began to reluctantly set himself to oppose the ever-increasing Papal greed and extortion, against which the King himself had joined at last with the Bishops and barons in an emphatic protest (A.D. 1246). In A.D. 1250 Grosseteste proceeded in person to Lyons, where the Papal Court then was, and in a sermon which he caused to be read before Pope and Cardinals he rebuked them in stinging words for the terrible world-wide corruptions of which Rome was the spring and source. Returning to his own diocese, he began there a searching reformation. Before long, the Pope appointed his own nephew, a mere boy and not even in Holy Orders, to a canonry in Lincoln Cathedral! This brought matters to an issue. Grosseteste refused obedience to the Papal mandate; he worded his refusal in the strongest possible terms of respectful protest and condemnation; and then he appealed to the whole nation to uphold the independence of the English Church against the intrusions of Rome. A warm supporter of the friars, to whom he looked for a reform of the Church, a learned and voluminous author,¹ and an earnest member of the patriot party, of which Simon de Montfort was leader, this great

which it was henceforth exclusively reared. Hence Chaucer's poor Oxford student prefers to have

“at his beddes hed
A twenty bokes, clad in black or red,
Of Aristotle and his philosophie,
Than robes riche, or fidel or sautrie.”

Canterbury Tales, Prologue, ll. 293-296.

¹ He was acquainted with both Greek and Hebrew, and was the first translator of the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle into Latin from the original Greek. “For the next two centuries there was scarcely a writer of note who was not affected by him. The number of his writings was very large—on subjects connected with Canon Law, Theology, Agriculture, and Education.”—BISHOP CREIGHTON, *Lecture in St. Paul’s Cathedral*, November, 1895.

Bishop was one of the very foremost figures of his time, till his death in A.D. 1253.

§ 143. *Simon de Montfort. The Civil Struggle.*—One more effort had now to be made—one more blow to be struck—before English liberty, founded on the Great Charter, which had been again and again confirmed by Henry, was secure. That effort was made, and that blow struck, by the Earl of Leicester, Simon de Montfort, who was brother-in-law of the King, and headed the patriot party (§ 139), while, like his friend Bishop Grosseteste, he was a warm patron of the friars. In A.D. 1258 the barons assembled in arms under his leadership, and the famous *Provisions of Oxford* were drawn up to reform the administration of the State, and secure good government for the future. They established a supreme Council of Fifteen, with a body of twelve annually elected representatives of the nation, and annual election of sheriffs and of all State officers, and were sworn to by King Henry. But, as before in the case of King John (§ 137), the Pope interfered to annul the Provisions, and release the English King from his solemn oath to observe them;¹ and once more that interference brought about a short, sharp civil war, in which the national clergy, the Universities, and the people of the towns were enthusiastic supporters on the side of liberty. After his victory and capture of the King at Lewes (A.D. 1264), De Montfort placed English freedom on its true basis by summoning the first truly representative English Parliament that ever sat (A.D. 1265). There had been from time immemorial the Royal Council to advise the King, consisting of the nobles of the realm with the Bishops and certain Abbots, and now known as the House of Lords (§ 65). But the principle of electing not only knights from the shires²

¹ This Pope was Alexander IV. (A.D. 1254-61). His successor, Urban IV. (1261-4), confirmed the release, of which Prince Edward, mindful of his motto “Pactum serva,” refused to avail himself.

² Their summons to Parliament (first in A.D. 1254, and again in A.D.

but burgesses from the cities and boroughs as *representatives* to sit with the nobles and prelates in the Great Council of the nation was first put into practice by Simon de Montfort.¹ He fell—and his fall was in popular estimation a martyrdom equal to Becket's²—at the battle of Evesham the same year (A.D. 1265) : but his work was afterwards, as we shall see, taken up and consolidated by the political sagacity of his godson and enthusiastic admirer, Henry's own son, EDWARD I.

§ 144. *S. Lewis of France. The Pragmatic Sanction.*—Since A.D. 1226 there had been reigning across the water a saintly King, Lewis IX. of France, who, like our own Confessor two centuries earlier, exercised in his high position an enormous influence for good upon his generation,

“Wearing the white flower of a blameless life”

with a calm, deep religiousness of conduct which stood even the searching test of the

“fierce light which beats upon a throne
And blackens every blot.”³,

He touches English history at one point, his unsuccessful attempt at arbitration between Henry III. and his barons (the “Mise of Amiens”), A.D. 1264. Of far greater interest and importance is his resolute reassertion of the liberties of the National Church of France (which has now, alas, long since succumbed again to

1261) has been traced back to the action of King John in the year 1213, who directed the sheriffs by writ that four discreet knights should be sent to him from each shire, “ad loquendum nobiscum de negotiis regni nostri.” Compare p. 53, n. 4.

¹ Compare the close parallel of the representative government established in Sicily by the Emperor Frederick II. (above, p. 119) : “All the barons and prelates appeared in person ; each of the larger cities sent four representatives, each smaller city two, each town or other place one ; to these were joined all the great and lesser bailiffs of the Crown.”

—DEAN MILMAN, *Latin Christianity*, vol. iv., p. 264.

² Milman, *l.c.*, p. 428.

³ See Tennyson's noble lines on the Prince Consort (“Idylls of the King,” *Dedication*).

Rome¹⁾ by the memorable Pragmatic (*i.e.* Deliberative) Sanction of A.D. 1269. This remarkable stir for liberty in a neighbouring and sister Church heralded the coming stir for liberty in our own.

§ 145. The Seventh Crusade. Close of Henry III.'s Reign.—S. Lewis of France, who had already headed the abortive Sixth Crusade of A.D. 1249,² joined the Seventh, and last, Crusade which was provoked by the conquests of the Mameluke Sultans of Egypt. He fell ill and died at Carthage (A.D. 1270), and was eventually canonized by the Pope. Our own Prince Edward carried on the war alone in Palestine, and, at the head of a mere handful of troops, “emulated the fame of his uncle Richard, and extorted by his valour a ten years’ truce.”³ King Henry III. closed his troubled reign of fifty-six years in A.D. 1272, while his gallant young son Edward was still absent fighting in the Holy Land. The last seven years of this long and eventful reign had proved tranquil. It was Henry III. who rebuilt (A.D. 1245-69) in all its present magnificence Westminster Abbey, which Edward the Confessor had reared before the Norman Conquest (§ 95).

§ 146. Edward I. and the English Constitution. The Three Estates.—The glory of Edward I.’s reign which now followed (A.D. 1272-1307) is his wise and masterly settlement of the English Constitution on its

¹ The Pragmatic Sanction was annulled, and the Church of France reabsorbed by the Papacy, in A.D. 1516.

² The Fourth Crusade (A.D. 1203), the result of Innocent’s III.’s tireless energy, turned aside to the conquest of Constantinople, which remained in Latin hands till recovered by the Greeks in A.D. 1261. The Fifth (A.D. 1218) and Sixth (A.D. 1249-54) both failed miserably in Egypt. Jerusalem was recovered by Frederick II. (p. 119, n. 1) in A.D. 1228. It was finally lost to the Christians in A.D. 1243, and has been in Mohammedan hands ever since.

³ GIBBON. Nineteen years later, Acre, the last Christian stronghold, fell, and the Latin Christians were finally expelled from the soil of Palestine. (See also § 158 below.) Another Crusade was attempted in A.D. 1312, but it was frustrated by Pope Clement V.

present basis by following the example set by De Montfort (§ 143), and admitting *elected representatives* to the National Council, though they were as yet summoned only for taxation purposes, and sat at first side by side with the Lords (see § 160), who had hitherto been the sole members of the Council (§ 65). In order to obtain taxation from all classes alike, from the property of the Church¹ as well as that of private persons, the King summoned to Parliament in A.D. 1295 *two representatives from every shire, city, and borough*, and also representatives of the *clergy*, two for each diocese and one for each Cathedral chapter, with the archdeacons and the heads of chapters, who were to attend in person. They were summoned indirectly through the Bishops, who were required to "premonish" them to attend them to Parliament—all, Lords and Commons alike, sitting together at this time in one House. Thus in this great Parliament of A.D. 1295 the Three Estates of the Realm—Clergy, Lords, and Commons—were all for the first time fully represented: and this Parliament has been the model of all our Parliaments ever since. To this day the "premonishing" clause is still inserted in the writ which summons the Bishops to their seats in Parliament, although it has long ceased to be acted upon, because the clergy soon left off going to Parliament,² preferring to tax themselves in their own assemblies, the Church Convocations. Yet that "premonishing" clause, still inserted, bears its silent witness to the rights of the clergy as one of the Three Estates of the Realm. (It is sometimes in modern days strangely supposed that the

¹ The taxation of spiritualities, *i.e.* of the tithes and offerings to the clergy, had been one of the fruits of the alliance between Henry III. and the Pope. See Bishop Stubbs, "Const. Hist." vol. ii., pp. 171 ff.

² *Op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 195, vol. iii., p. 320. "There are indications to show that the clergy actually sat by their representatives in the House of Commons down to the end of the fourteenth century—for a hundred years, that is, after the death of the great king."—CANON DIXON, *Hist. Ch. Eng.*, vol. ii., p. 470.

“Three Estates” are King, Lords, and Commons, as though the *King* had ever been an Estate of the Realm!¹⁾ This too explains why *clergymen* are to this day forbidden to be elected members of Parliament, just as Lords are also forbidden. It is because, in the theory of the Constitution, each of the Three Estates has *its own separate representation* in the one united Parliament.

§ 147. *The Church Convocations*.—The clergy, however, chose *not* to exercise their right to go and sit in Parliament, but to meet for taxation in their own ancient provincial assemblies, the two Convocations of Canterbury and York.² These accordingly meet when Parliament meets, and are in session at the same time, forming the Church’s Parliament.³ In A.D. 1664, after the restoration of the Monarchy, the clergy gave up their ancient right of taxing themselves, and the Convocations thus lost in fact very much of their power, just as the House of Commons would do if it gave up its right of taxation. They still met regularly to deliberate on all matters connected with the Church till A.D. 1717, when a gross wrong was committed against the Church of England by the State (one out of many in modern times), from which she suffered immensely all the last century and part of this: the voice of Convocation was stopped; and although it still continued to formally meet, as of old, when Parliament assembled, it was not allowed to do any business or to deliberate! Almost irreparable mischief was thus done to the Church and to religion during the eighteenth century; and from its effects the Church has only within the last half-century in some degree

¹⁾ See Bishop Stubbs, “*Const. Hist.*” vol. ii. p., 168.

²⁾ The union of the two assemblies into one National Synod, as in the days of Theodore (§ 49), has never yet been carried out, although it was one of the reforms which Wolsey (§ 206) planned before his fall.

³⁾ The representation of the parochial clergy by two proctors elected from each diocese (Canterbury) or each archdeaconry (York) was settled in A.D. 1279-83, and has remained unaltered ever since.

recovered. The wrong and anomaly, being at last acquiesced in by her own members, continued far longer than would otherwise have been the case : and it was not till as recently as A.D. 1852 that Churchmen succeeded in reasserting the constitutional rights of the Convocations to deliberate. Since then they have met regularly for debate, when Parliament is in session, and very valuable their labours have been : the paralysis which overtook the Church in the cold deadness of the last century has now passed utterly away.

§ 148. *The Church's Parliament*.—Thus, then, the Church has her own Parliament, representing the clergy, and made a part of the machinery of government by Edward I. at the selfsame time as the House of Commons. The principle of *representation* for both had first appeared in the reign of Henry III. (§ 143); both were systematized and regulated by his wise and able son, Edward I.; and both have been in continuous existence ever since.¹ And the efforts of Edward I. to obtain the *taxation* of Church property help to show (if showing were needed) the folly of those who pretend that the Church's property is national in the sense that the State may step in and confiscate it when it likes and how it likes. It was never given to the *Nation*, but to the National *Church*,² to be used by her for the service of God for ever ; and it has come to her in the same way as the property of the Dissenting bodies has now come to them, by the gifts and donations of her own members from age to age (§§ 28, 57, 77).

§ 149. *Expulsion of the Jews from England*.—The Jews had come over to England with the Normans, and now had settlements of their own, known as "Jewries," in all the leading towns. They had

¹ The distinction between the Two Estates which have sat together from time immemorial (§ 65) in the House of Lords is still preserved in their title, "Lords Spiritual and Lords Temporal."

² Compare below, § 161, end.

hitherto found steady protection from the successive Kings against the hatred and deadly antipathy in which they were held, and which was increased by their wealth and usury. During the late reign serious riots had broken out, and especially the famous one at Lincoln in A.D. 1255, which ended in the canonization of little S. Hugh, a Christian boy who, according to the popular belief, had been crucified by them and then flung into a well. The incident is alluded to by Chaucer (below, § 167),¹ whose "Prioresses Tale" is founded on a similar mediæval story; and the remains of what was once the child's magnificent shrine are still shown in Lincoln Cathedral.² King Edward I. shared to the full his subjects' abhorrence of the unhappy race: in A.D. 1290 the Jews were expelled from England³ to the number of 16,000: and, strange to say, for more than three centuries and a half, down to the time of Oliver Cromwell, none of God's ancient people were allowed to live in England.

§ 150. Edward I. and the Pope. Statute of Mortmain. Archbishop Winchelsey.—Edward I. was an Englishman to his heart's core; and his reign, the great era of constitutional settlement, did not pass without a contest with the overweening pretensions of Rome, another step in the persistent struggle which was at last to give back to the Church of England her full liberties at the Reformation. In A.D. 1279 John

¹ "Prioresses Tale":

"O yonge Hew of Lincoln slaine also
With cursed Jewes, as it is notable,
For it n'is but a litel while ago,
Pray eke for us, we sinful folk unstable," etc.

For an earlier instance, the canonization of a child of Norwich, S. William, in the reign of Stephen, see the "English Chronicle," under the year 1137.

² The little body was found underneath, in its stone coffin, A.D. 1791.

³ A similar and still more cruel outbreak took place in France, under Papal sanction, in A.D. 1319, when many Jews were burned to death. For England see J. R. Green's "Short History," pp. 86, 87, 205, and 591.

de Peckham, a Franciscan friar, was—like his predecessor, the Dominican friar Kilwardby¹ seven years before—nominated Archbishop by the Pope; and as a friar he naturally showed himself completely subservient to the Papacy (§ 140, end). In A.D. 1279, and again two years later, he had to be taught the strength of the Royal Supremacy, and by King and Parliament was forced to give up his inordinate claim to *complete clerical independence* of the State courts and officers (compare § 130). In A.D. 1279 also the great Statute of Mortmain ("De Religiosis") was passed to stop the rapid acquisition of landed property by monasteries or other religious corporations, by forbidding any gift or sale of lands or tenements which would have the effect of bringing them into *Mortmain*, or "Dead Hand." This name expressed the fact that the very numerous and lucrative succession duties, aids, and other feudal profits could no longer be obtained from them, and thus were irrevocably lost to the overlord, and ultimately to the Sovereign. Six years later the powers of the ecclesiastical courts (first set up, it will be remembered, by William the Conqueror) were limited and defined by the Statute "Circumspecte Agatis" (A.D. 1285).² But it was in the years 1296-7 that the real struggle came. In the previous year Edward had carefully provided, as we saw above, for the due representation of all his subjects, the clergy included, in Parliament, with a view to their taxation (§ 146). But suddenly the rashest and most imperious of the Popes, the notorious Boniface VIII., "that came into his popedom like a fox, that

¹ In A.D. 1278 this Primate, being appointed a Cardinal and Bishop of Porto, carried off with him from England a quantity of the Church ornaments, and *all the old Canterbury registers*, which his successor, the next Archbishop, vainly attempted to recover, and which "may yet be lurking among the stores of the Vatican."—CANON JENKINS, *Hist. of Canterbury*, pp. 156, 157, 175.

² This statute was re-enacted, and the limits of the secular jurisdiction further defined, by the subsequent "Articuli Cleri" passed at the petition of the clergy in Edward II.'s reign (A.D. 1316).

reigned like a lion, and died like a dog”¹ (see below, § 154), issued his famous Bull (*i.e.* Decree),² “Clericis Laicos,” forbidding absolutely all taxation of ecclesiastical property, excommunicating all Sovereigns who exacted it, and all clergy who should pay it, without his sanction! The enormous financial pressure which the Pope could thus have brought to bear in every kingdom of Christendom is obvious. The decree was aimed, though not by name, against the reigning monarchs of France and England, Philip the Fair and Edward I., who both refused to pay any heed whatever to it. Edward in particular had no intention of allowing his careful arrangements for taxation to be upset by the foreign Pontiff; and a sharp struggle ensued between the King and the new Primate Winchelsey, who, after nomination by the King and election by the Canterbury chapter, had been accepted and consecrated at Rome. In the end all clergy who refused to pay by a fixed date were outlawed, and their property ordered to be publicly sold, and this was actually done in the case of the Archbishop himself. Happily, the Pope had now been induced to relax somewhat the terms of his unwise decree: the clergy retreated from their unconstitutional position: and Edward I. thus carried finally the point which was one of the main objects of his reign—the taxation of the clergy, as of the laity, in duly representative assemblies.³

¹ Homily for Whit-Sunday, towards the end: quoting the famous Latin epigram upon this Pope. It was Boniface VIII. who added to the Papal tiara its *second* crown, to signify his claim to secular as well as ecclesiastical sovereignty, a claim which, it is well to remember, the Popes have never given up (compare § 154). The *third* crown was added later by Urban V. (A.D. 1362-70) to signify his claim to be the reigning representative of Christ.

² Latin *Bulla*, a seal. So called from the large leaden *seal* appended to these Papal documents, which, it may be noted, are named, like other documents (compare p. 145, n. 1), from their opening words in Latin.

³ This important blow to the Papal power in England marks the beginning of “a new phase of ecclesiastical and civil relations” (Bishop Stubbs, “Const. Hist.” vol. ii., p. 146). It was this contest between

§ 151. *Conquest of Wales and Scotland. Claim of Boniface VIII.*—There was yet another collision with the Pope in this important reign. In A.D. 1282 Edward had conquered Wales and annexed it to England, propitiating the Welsh by conferring the title “Prince of Wales” upon his own son, the future Edward II., who had just been born, as it happened, at Carnarvon : and this has ever since been the title of each English monarch’s eldest son. In A.D. 1296 he conquered Scotland also, and removed from Scone Abbey the sacred coronation stone, on which the Scotch Kings had for ages been crowned : he placed it in Westminster Abbey, where it still remains ; and it has been used regularly at the coronation of our Sovereigns ever since. But Scotland rose in the following year under its great national hero, William Wallace ; and the same Pope Boniface, who had recently arbitrated between England and France, being now appealed to in their extremity by the Scotch, claimed Scotland as an ancient Papal fief, and ordered Edward to withdraw from the country, and submit his claim to the judgment of Rome (A.D. 1299). The sequel of this strange proceeding will come before us in the next chapter (§ 153). Meanwhile we may notice here one fact always forgotten or put out of sight by those who talk glibly about State-endowment of the Church, viz., that in addition to the innumerable *gifts* of her own children bestowed freely upon her down the centuries, much of the Church’s property was acquired by actual *purchase*. “The statute *Quia Emptores*¹ shows abundantly that the possessions of the Church were greatly increased by purchase, as well as by

the King and the clergy which enabled the barons to wrest now from Edward I. a formal recognition of one of the fundamental principles of the Great Charter and of English liberty—the illegality of laying any tax or impost upon the realm without the common consent (*ib.*, pp. 131-147).

¹ This was part of the Edwardine legislation. It was passed in A.D. 1290, and enacted that a purchaser of land should hold not from the seller of it, but from the overlord.

donation and bequest.”¹ How would Dissenters like all their chapel property and endowments to be swept away by the State on the plea that it has given them—as it has given them in past days²—some grants of money? Would this be just and fair treatment, or would they term it iniquitous robbery and spoliation?³

¹ Dean Milman, “Latin Christianity,” vol. vi., p. 197, n. 5.

² The “Regium Donum,” an annual State grant to the English Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists, began in A.D. 1722, and lasted for a period of a hundred and thirty years, till A.D. 1851.

³ Compare also Appendix D, p. 322, iv.

CHAPTER IX

THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY. GROWING TENSION WITH ROME. WYCLIFFE AND THE LOLLAARDS

“ And God amend the Pope—that pilleth Holy Church,
And Claimeth by force to be King—to be Keeper over Christendom,
And Counteth not how Christian Men be Killed and robbed,
And Findeth Folk to Fight—and Christian blood to spill.”

Piers Ploughman's Vision (A.D. 1380).¹

“ In a debate between Cardinal Carvajal and Rockisane, the famous Calixtin Archbishop of Prague, at the Council of Basle, the former said he would reduce the whole argument to two syllables—CREDE. The latter replied he would do the same, and confine himself to two others—PROBA.”—HALLAM, *Const. Hist.*, vol. i., p. 192 n.

§ 152. *Close of Edward I.'s Reign. Position of the Papacy.*—During the first seven years of the fourteenth century Edward I. was still upon the English throne. It is at this time that one of the great world-poets, the Italian DANTE (A.D. 1265-1321), whose exile from Florence took place in A.D. 1301, paints for us the Papacy at the height of its power, just at the moment when it began to totter to its fall. Its frowning battlements, built up, as we have seen, on the rotten foundations of superstition and forgery, and cemented with blood,² were now to be shaken into ruin—magnificent still in their ruin—by a succession of earthquake shocks. The first of these was the contest with France, and its sequel the so-called “ Babylonian Captivity ”; the second the Great Schism, and its sequel the Three Councils; the third the Renaissance,

¹ Quoted by Dean Milman, “Latin Christianity,” vol. vi., p. 358 n.

² See above, §§ 97 end, 118, 133.

and its sequel the Reformation. These great events will claim our attention in the course of this and of the following chapters.

§ 153. *Parliament and the Pope*.—The peremptory demands of Boniface VIII. in the matter of Scotland (§ 151) were deeply resented in England. The Parliament of Lincoln, A.D. 1301, sent the Pope a vigorous and spirited reply, pointing out the independence of the English Crown (§ 105, end), and declaring its determination to maintain inviolate the rights of the King, and the ancient “liberties, customs, and laws” of the realm, of which Englishmen have in all ages been characteristically tenacious (§ 52). “We do not permit,” was the gist of their communication, “we ought not to permit, our lord the King to do the things demanded of him, and even were he minded to do so, we would not allow him to do them or to make the attempt.” Thus was the shameful vassalage to which King John had stooped emphatically disowned and repudiated by the voice of the nation in Parliament.

§ 154. *Papal Struggle with France. The Bull “Unam Sanctam.”*—Baffled in England, Pope Boniface turned to that frantic struggle with Philip the Fair, King of France, in which his issue of a Bull of excommunication and deposition ended so unexpectedly in his own discomfiture, madness, and death (A.D. 1303). In the course of the struggle the Pope sent forth that famous decree which marks the absolute climax of the Papal pretensions, the Bull “*Unam Sanctam*.” It claims for the Pope, in the most express and definite language possible, supreme power, both spiritual and secular,¹ and closes with the proud words, “*We therefore declare, pronounce, and define that it is absolutely of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman*

¹ See p. 133, n. 1.

pontiff"! In words such as these, at which history stands aghast, the Bishops of Rome have written down their own emphatic condemnation.¹ The Bull was re-enacted by Leo X. in A.D. 1516, just before the Reformation commenced, and is still theoretically binding in the Church of Rome, to be revived in full force whenever opportunity may offer.²

§ 155. *The Statute of Carlisle*.—In the very last year of Edward I.'s momentous reign, A.D. 1307, although the King was then on the friendliest terms with the Pope, Clement V. (see below) who had formerly been his subject,³ the English Parliament again spoke out strongly against the abuses of Papal interference. The Statute of Carlisle, passed by it against the exactions and oppressions of the Pope in England, is memorable as the *first* of a long series of antipapal measures, which, long before the Reformation, were, as we shall see, already in operation against the mischiefs of the Roman domination (§ 114).

§ 156. *The "Babylonian Captivity." Infamy of the Papal Court*.—The ignominious defeat of Boniface VIII. in his struggle with France shook the Papal power to its basis; and his successor, Benedict XI., hastened to revoke all the measures against France. Two years later, Clement V., a non-Italian (see above), became Pope; and he, by a secret agreement made with the French King before his election, left Rome altogether, settling eventually on the borders of France at Avignon (A.D. 1305). And for nearly *seventy years*⁴ we have the extraordinary spectacle of the so-called Bishops of Rome living far away from Rome, and even from Italy, in abject dependence on the Kings of France—with whom, for a great part of the time,

¹ 1 Tim. iii. 6.

² Compare above, p. 114, n. 3.

³ He was a Gascon by birth, and Archbishop of Bordeaux when elected to the Papacy.

⁴ Urban V. (§ 163) returned to Rome in A.D. 1367, but three years later went back to Avignon.

England was at war. During this long sojourn of the Popes on foreign soil (known as the “Babylonian Captivity”¹) scandal ever deepened around the thoroughly rotten Papal Court, which again became a by-word for corruption and depravity, in very fact a “cage of every unclean and hateful bird” (Rev. xviii. 2). No wonder that all the while there was growing and spreading among the faithful the desire and yearning for a thorough reformation “in head and members” (as the phrase then went),² which in England found an articulate voice, as before in Grosseteste (§ 142), so again in Wycliffe and his “poor priests,” and eventually in the Reformation.

§ 157. Reign of Edward II. Home misery and Papal greed.—The reign of Edward I. had been great and glorious, but that of his son and successor, Edward II. (A.D. 1307-27), was both weak and despicable, and fraught with misery to England, till after twenty years he was, as the issue of a plot headed by his own French wife, deposed from the throne as unfit to govern, being publicly charged in Parliament with incapacity and indolence, the loss of Scotland, Ireland, and Gascony, oppression of the Church and the baronage, and violation of his coronation oath. The Popes had taken full advantage of this English monarch’s feebleness to renew their encroachments; and by “reservations” and “provisions” (see §§ 139, 161) of sees as well as of benefices, and also by rigidly enforc-

¹ This name may be traced back to the Abbot Joachim (p. 121, n. 1), whose writings had exercised so enormous an influence throughout the preceding century, and who gave this title to the bondage of the Church to the Empire, denoting by it what we mean by the more recent term *Erastianism*.

² As early as A.D. 1312 we have an important scheme of sweeping reform proposed at the Council of Vienne by the learned Durantis, Bishop of Mende. He strenuously advocated the abolition of the Papal pretensions, the revival of General Councils, with a mere Primacy for the Pope as of old (§ 13), the permission of clerical matrimony as in the East, and a thorough purging away of the rampant abuses in the Church. His effort bore fruit, as we shall see, hereafter.

ing the newly-devised payment of "Annates," i.e. the first year's income of all benefices after a vacancy (see § 222), they rapidly and unscrupulously filled their coffers at the expense of the National Church. "*Lord Jesu*," exclaims a monk-chronicler of the period, "*either take away the Pope from our midst, or diminish his power!*"

§ 158. *Loss of Scotland. Suppression of the Knights Templars.*—The chief political event of this unhappy reign was the disgraceful loss of Scotland—disgraceful to us, but glorious to the Scotch—by the victory of Robert Bruce at Bannockburn (A.D. 1314). The chief ecclesiastical event was the suppression, in the year 1307, of the Knights Templars, or "Red Cross Knights,"¹ at the bidding of the Pope. This famous Order of monkish Crusaders had been founded in A.D. 1118, nearly two centuries before, to guard pilgrims visiting the sacred spots of Palestine from the Saracens (§ 106). But now, after the final loss of Palestine (p. 127, n. 3), they had ceased to be of service,² and the turbulence, rapacity, and pride for which they had long been noted had no legitimate outlet. Whether dreading their immense power, or coveting their immense possessions, or both, King Philip, on pretence of secret enormities which had no real existence, roughly suppressed the Order throughout France; and the Pope, his obedient vassal (§ 156), consented to dissolve the whole vast organization of the Order throughout the world. His directions were obeyed in England: the Templars were arrested; they were condemned to perpetual imprisonment in monasteries (far worse was their fate in France); and their property was all confiscated. The King bestowed the monastery

¹ So called from the red cross worn by them on the left breast. The Knights Hospitallers wore a white cross.

² The rival Order of *Knights Hospitallers*, on the other hand, continued to render good service against the Turks at Rhodes (A.D. 1309-1522), and then at Malta, which remained in their possession from A.D. 1533 till their expulsion by Napoleon in the year 1798.

in London upon the Earl of Pembroke ; after his death it was given (A.D. 1323) to the rival Order of Knights Hospitallers, and from them it was leased by the law-students, whose headquarters it has ever since remained, being finally presented to the Benchers by James I. (A.D. 1608).¹ The beautiful Temple Church, dedicated by the Patriarch of Jerusalem in A.D. 1185, is still in use ; it is one of the four "Round Churches" built in England, in fond imitation of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, itself modelled, like some other memorial churches abroad, on the ancient Roman circular tombs. Another of the four (there are only four in England) is the well-known "Round Church," S. Sepulchre's, at Cambridge.²

§ 159. *The Fourteenth Century Schoolmen. Struggle of Pope and Emperor.*—It is very remarkable that to England, and to the University of Oxford in particular, belongs the honour of having produced the four leading Schoolmen, the four deepest thinkers, of the fourteenth century. The first of these, Duns Scotus, died very early, A.D. 1308 ; his followers, the Franciscan *Scotists*, were the very bitter rivals thenceforth, in all the subtleties of intellectual thought and theological speculation, of the Dominican *Thomists* of Paris, the followers of S. Thomas Aquinas (§ 141). Ockham was a Franciscan, celebrated not only as a great philosophical thinker, the forerunner of Locke and of Kant,³ but yet more for his bold attacks on the whole *Papal claim to temporal power*, as literary champion first of Philip the Fair in his struggle with Pope Boniface (§ 154), and then, later, of the German Emperor Lewis of Bavaria against Pope John XXII. (see below). Bradwardine, the profound and pious

¹ The property had come again to the Crown at the Dissolution of the monasteries (§ 254).

² The other two are at Maplestead in Essex (built by the Hospitallers) and Northampton.

³ See Dean Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. vi., p. 296.

thinker, was Divinity Professor at Oxford and champion of the Augustinian Predestinarianism against the Pelagianism (§ 17) of the Scotists.¹ The last, and in some respects the greatest, of the four is one of whom we shall have much to say hereafter, John de Wycliffe.² The just-mentioned contest between the German Emperor and Pope John XXII. broke out in A.D. 1322, and lasted till the death of Lewis, A.D. 1347.³ This long struggle, which turned on the old question of the limits of the Papal power, is of much importance as giving a further impulse to the feeling against the abuses engendered by the centralized despotism of Rome, which was now assailed in widely-read works by Ockham and others, who championed the cause of ecclesiastical and civil liberty, and advocated the revival of General Councils and the restriction of the Papacy to the simple Primacy of older days (compare p. 139, n. 2). The importance of this will appear presently. Meanwhile, we return to England, where, in A.D. 1327, Edward III., at the early age of fifteen, was made King in place of his unhappy and dethroned father (§ 157).⁴

§ 160. *Reign of Edward III. The House of Commons.*—In Edward III. (A.D. 1327-77) England found once more an able and vigorous ruler. The reign was one of very great military glory. Again and again the English, invading France, beat the French on their own soil, and against overwhelming odds,⁵ although

¹ Compare Chaucer's most interesting allusion to him, "Nonne Prestes Tale," ll. 413-430. Bradwardine was made Archbishop of Canterbury A.D. 1349, and was cut off the same year by the "Black Death."

² For the spelling of this famous name, it seems certainly best to follow that of the Yorkshire village with which it is connected.

³ In A.D. 1324 the Pope laid Germany under the horrors of the "Long Interdict" (compare § 134). Charles IV. of Bohemia, the Papal nominee of A.D. 1346, became undisputed Emperor after the death of Lewis, and issued the famous "Golden Bull" ten years later. (See p. 182, n. 1.)

⁴ Eight months after his deposition Edward II. was foully murdered in Berkeley Castle.

⁵ France had provoked the contest by aiding the Scotch. Edward III. claimed the French crown through his mother, Isabella, daughter of Philip the Fair.

France was then at the height of her power and greatness. At home the reign is especially important for the growth of the power of popular representation in Parliament. The *elected members*, who had probably sat at first side by side with the nobles and Bishops in the National Council (§ 146), now, in A.D. 1341, finally drew apart from them, and became the "House of Commons"; the rest of the Council, the barons and prelates who had in former days been the only Council, now formed the "House of Lords"; and the two Houses have remained thus distinct from that time down to the present day. In the history of the Church of England the reign is memorable first for the steady growth of national opposition to the intruded Papal power, evinced in continuous protests and statutes, and secondly on account of the appearance of the great reformer, the last of the Schoolmen, Wycliffe, the first translator of the Bible, as a whole, into the English language, and the "morning star" of the yet distant Reformation.

§ 161. *The King and the Pope. Statute of Provisors. Appointment of Bishops.*—First, then, the King, after protests against the Papal encroachments on the Royal prerogative of confirming the election of the English Bishops (p. 110, n. 2), proceeded in A.D. 1343 to forbid not only the introduction of Papal letters or Bulls, but the whole system of "reservations" and "provisions" which quartered foreigners upon the English Church to its very grievous harm (§§ 139, 157), and had become a nuisance well-nigh intolerable. By "reservation" the Pope claimed to *reserve* to himself beforehand the next appointment to some benefice not yet vacant; and by "provision" he appointed his own nominee to the benefice. Thus he had been frequently able, since the reign of Henry III., to set at naught the rights of private patrons or the Crown, and appoint to benefices and sees whom he liked. The King's vigorous action was followed up by a personal letter to the

Pope ; and in A.D. 1351 the Statute of Provisors, besides re-enacting the Statute of Carlisle (§ 155) made it unlawful henceforth for the Pope to exercise patronage at all in England, whether by reservations or provisions, or otherwise. Anyone accepting such provision was to be imprisoned and heavily fined ;¹ all preferments to which the Pope nominated were forfeited for that turn to the King. And the right of appointment to English sees (§ 109), which was in danger of being altogether lost by the Crown, was now secured by the practice which we still employ, by which the King transmits to the Cathedral chapter (p. 92, n. 3), together with the *congé d'érire*, i.e. licence to elect, the name of a special clergyman, selected by the Crown as suitable for the post ; whose election by the chapter is followed by the *consecration*, which gives him the office and position of Bishop in the Church of God (see above, § 65). This is the method still used for the appointment of our English Bishops.² And let us pause to remind ourselves that the period we have reached is still *two centuries* before the Reformation, and that then, as now, and throughout her long history, the Church of England has *been* the Church of England, and not the Church of *Rome*, as people ignorant or heedless of her history so often suppose her to have been before the Reformation. The preamble of this very Statute of Provisors (A.D. 1351) contains a solemn declaration that “ *the holy Church of England was founded in the estate of prelacy within the realm of England, by King Edward and his progenitors, and the earls, barons and other nobles of his said realm and their ancestors, to inform them and their people of the law of God, and to make hospitalities, alms, and other works of charity, in the places where the churches were founded, for the souls of the founders, their heirs, and all Christians* ; and

¹ In the following year all purchasers of Papal “ provision ” were outlawed.

² Compare Hooker, “ Ecc. Pol.” viii. 7. 2 ; and below, § 227.

certain possessions, as well in fees, lands, rents, as in advowsons, which do extend to a great value, were assigned by the said founders to the prelates and other people of the holy Church of the said realm," etc.

§ 162. *First Statute of Præmunire.*—The exercise of Papal patronage in England had thus been made illegal by the Statute of Provisors. And two years later another great statute, that of Præmunire,¹ was passed, abolishing the system of appeal from English courts to the Pope, which had gradually crept in since the Norman Conquest (§ 102). It was now enacted that any who prosecuted their suits in courts "not within the realm" should be liable to outlawry, forfeiture of goods, and imprisonment. *Neither of these great statutes was ever repealed.* Both, as we shall see, were taken up and made still more stringent in the following reign, and they remain enduring witnesses to the national independence of the English Church before, as since, the Reformation.

§ 163. *Rejection of Papal Tribute. John Wycliffe.*—In A.D. 1365 Pope Urban V. demanded from England *thirty-three years' arrears* of the tribute promised by King John, which, after having been already refused by Edward I., had been obtained again from Edward II. in A.D. 1317.² The claim was discussed separately by each of the Three Estates (p. 128) in the Parliament of A.D. 1366, and was unanimously repudiated, so indignantly and emphatically that it was never heard of again. John Wycliffe, hereafter to be so renowned in the task of reformation, had become, for a short time, Master of Balliol College at Oxford in A.D. 1361, and was already known there as a keen logical disputant of unrivalled learning,³ and an unsparing opponent of the

¹ The Statute of Præmunire has its name from the opening words of the writ issued under it to the sheriff, "Præmunire facias . . ." A second Statute of Præmunire was passed in A.D. 1365, and a third, the most important one, in the year 1393. See below, § 174.

² Dean Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. v., p. 481.

³ "In philosophia nulli reputabatur secundus, in scholasticis dis-

degenerate friars (§ 140, end), whose stronghold Oxford then was.¹ He made at this juncture his first great mark in public life by drawing up, as Royal chaplain, an important paper against this Papal claim.

§ 164. *The "Black Death." Wycliffe and Church Property.*—The glorious reign of Edward III. was now ending in disaster and gloom. At the close of A.D. 1348, and again in the years 1361 and 1369, there reached England one of the most terrible plagues ever known, the "Black Death," which depopulated whole villages and towns, and is computed to have swept away in all more than half the English population, leaving behind a legacy of lawlessness and fearful misery, to which the outbreak under Wat Tyler in the next reign (§ 171) was largely due. The weary struggle with France (§ 160) was about to be renewed:² and in the general exhaustion of revenue an unscrupulous band of nobles, headed eventually by the Duke of Lancaster, John of Gaunt, one of the King's own sons, began to project the spoliation of the Church. With this party Wycliffe linked himself, though utterly differing in his motives from them. Looking at the luxury of the higher clergy of his day, their great wealth, their want of spirituality, and their absorption in secular duties, he honestly believed that it would be better for the Church to be rid of her endowments, and to return to her original poverty.³ In A.D. 1368 (at latest) and

ciplinis *incomparabilis.*" This is the testimony of an enemy, the pseudo-Knighton. See "Student's Ecc. Hist." vol. ii., p. 633, n. 1.

¹ As opponent of the friars, Wycliffe took up the task in which the famous William of St. Amour had failed at the University of Paris a century earlier (A.D. 1254-70).

² It had closed with the Peace of Bretigny in A.D. 1360, and began again in A.D. 1369.

³ Compare the words of Langland's "Piers Ploughman" (A.D. 1380):

"For if Possession be Poison—and imPerfect these make
The Heads of Holy Church,
It were Charity to disCharge them for Holy Church sake,
And Purge them of the old Poison."

(Quoted by Dean Milman, *op. cit.*, vol. vi., p. 357 n. On the remark-

in 1371 he published two important Latin works on *Dominion*—“De Dominio Divino” and “De Dominio Civilis”—in which he explained the relations of man to God on the analogy of the feudal system which he saw in operation around him. The two chief practical points of his teaching were, firstly, that the State held its power immediately of God, just as the Church did, and was as supreme in temporal things as the Church in spiritual things, and might therefore take away property from a Church which failed in her spiritual duty; and secondly, that individuals likewise were feudatory vassals, holding directly of God, and responsible each to the tribunal of Him as their *Dominus*, i.e. feudal *overlord*. By the first he overthrew the Pope's claim to secular lordship, and also justified his advocacy of the confiscation of Church revenues proposed by John of Gaunt; by the second he vindicated the truth of *individual responsibility to God*,¹ which was to be one of the most important results of the yet distant Reformation.

§ 165. *The Modern Plan of Spoliation*.—It is worth while to observe that with all Wycliffe's strange ideas as to Church property—ideas which were “based on error and misapprehension, and would lead only to immoral confiscation”²—he would not have sympathized with the tactics of the modern “Liberationists,” according to whom the Church is to be stripped of her property, although she has never been more efficient in the discharge of her sacred duties, while the vast endowments of Dissenters are to be left untouched. If there is to be spoliation, it should be *spoliation all round*: but that is far from the thoughts of those who were quite recently attempting to get Parliament to

able connection between Langland and Wycliffe in the matter also of reform, see *ib.*, p. 363).

¹ On the way in which this momentous truth, so fruitful in its results, had been recently brought to light again by the German mystics, see Milman, *op. cit.*, vol. vi., pp. 379, 380.

² Dean Spence, “Ch. of Eng.” vol. ii., p. 319. See below, § 171.

lay hands on the property of the Church in Wales, leaving the *Dissenting chapels and funds there absolutely untouched!*

§ 166. *William of Wykeham.*—A strong political opponent of Wycliffe and John of Gaunt was William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester. He is celebrated as the introducer of the Perpendicular style of architecture,¹ the designer of Windsor Castle, and, above all, the founder, not only of New College, Oxford (A.D. 1386), but also of our first great public school, at Winchester (A.D. 1392).

§ 167. *Wycliffe at Lutterworth. His "Poor Priests."*—In A.D. 1374 Wycliffe was sent as a Royal commissioner, with others, to negotiate with the legates of Gregory XI., the last Avignon Pope (see § 169), at Bruges; and he returned to England deeply impressed with the corruptions of the Papal Court, of which we have already spoken (§ 156). At the rectory of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, now presented to him by the Crown as a reward for his services,² he commenced (A.D. 1375) his splendid efforts to promote the sorely-needed reforms in the Church, like Bishop Grosseteste before him. At Lutterworth he began that series of keen and vigorous pamphlets which marks him out as a master, the first great master, of modern English prose, just at the time that his contemporary, Geoffrey Chaucer, was evoking the first sweet strains of modern English poetry.³ And he now began to organize the

¹ The Gothic, or *Norman*, was gradually supplanted by the Pointed, or *Early English* style, at the end of the twelfth century; and that by the *Decorated*, from the beginning of Edward I.'s reign. King's Chapel, Cambridge, and Henry VII.'s Chapel in Westminster Abbey are well-known later instances of the *Florid*, or *Perpendicular* style, which is of exclusively English growth, and of which very many other superb examples exist in these islands.

² He was at the same time made a Prebendary of Westbury, in the diocese of Worcester. Lutterworth was not a Crown living; but the patron was then a minor.

³ For a similar interesting synchronism, see § 342 below. English was then just triumphing finally over French, which had till this century

famous body of itinerant evangelists—his “poor preachers” or “simple priests,” as they were called—whom he sent forth, two and two, with the simple popular preaching adapted to the needs of their hearers. They rapidly won their way to the hearts of the people, and permeated the country through and through with the ideas and doctrines of Wycliffe.

§ 168. *Accession of Richard II.*—In A.D. 1377, the jubilee year of Edward III.’s long and famous reign, the old warrior-King passed away, in feeble dotage. His eldest son, the “Black Prince,” had died the previous year, mourned by all England as the mirror of perfect chivalry; and therefore this idolized Prince’s little son, Richard II. (A.D. 1377-99), succeeded to his grandfather’s throne at the age of ten, his widowed mother, the Princess of Wales, becoming Regent. From her Wycliffe obtained needed protection against the clergy and the friars, of whose vices he was so unsparing a rebuker, and who had already invoked the interference of the Pope on their behalf,¹ an interference which was steadily disregarded by the new Government.

§ 169. *The Great Papal Schism. Its Importance.*—Pope Gregory XI. had just removed the Papal Court finally back to Rome, after its seventy years’ sojourn at Avignon (§ 156), and thus set the Papacy free at last from its state of humiliating dependence upon France. But only to bring upon it a worse mischief still. The great Papal schism, which inflicted on the already weakened Papal power a second blow, from which it has never fully recovered, arose at Gregory’s death, in the year after his return to Rome, and lasted for forty years (A.D. 1378-1417). It came about in

been, since the Conquest, the language of the higher classes and of the courts of law (J. R. Green, “Short History,” ch. v., *init.*).

¹ Bulls to arrest Wycliffe, not so far (see § 170) for heresy, but because of his dangerous views as to Church property and “Dominion,” were actually on their way to England at the time of Edward III.’s death.

this way. The new Pope, Urban VI., was elected at Rome under strong popular pressure; and a majority of the Cardinals, loth to give up residence at Avignon, and exasperated by the rashness and mad violence of Urban, left the city, and elected another Pope, Clement VII., who returned to Avignon. He found support from France, and also from Spain, Naples, and Scotland; while Urban VI., who continued to live at Rome, was acknowledged by England and most other countries. Thus began a scandalous struggle, in which Christendom saw again the spectacle of rival Popes, each cursing and excommunicating the adherents of the other, and each content to raise armies and shed Christian blood for his own aggrandisement! It was natural that this Papal schism, with the intolerable abuses and the multiplied exactions to which it quickly gave rise, should add a great impetus to the movement for reform (§ 156, end) throughout the Church. In particular it led, as we shall see, to the revival of the ancient Catholic principle, already reasserted by William of Ockham and others (§ 159), that General Councils are superior to the Pope. The Church of England appealed at the Reformation, and still appeals, from the unscriptural and uncatholic despotism of the Pope, the growth of which has destroyed the ancient unity of East and West (§ 97), to a future General Council of the whole of Christendom, freely convened as in the days of old, the only means by which, in God's good time, the Saviour's prayer shall again find fulfilment by the restoration of *outward and visible unity* in His Church (compare §§ 54, end, 322).

§ 170. *Wycliffe's Bible. Wycliffe and Doctrinal Reform.*—It was about A.D. 1377 that Wycliffe began the greatest and best-known work of his life—the translation of the Bible into English. Both the Bible and the Church Services were at this time still in Latin,¹

¹ See p. 244.

and not understood by ordinary hearers, for whose use there were therefore small books of devotion in English, which they might take with them to church.¹ But Wycliffe now began to translate the Bible into English for all to read. And as he did so, his eyes opened more and more to the errors and corruptions which had crept into the Church's doctrines, and especially into the popular presentment of them, during the long ages of ignorance.² In A.D. 1381 he electrified both friends and foes by publishing a declaration against the materialistic theory of Transubstantiation, while continuing to maintain in all its fulness³ the ancient and Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, as held by the Church in all ages, and held by the Church of England still (see above, § 99). Thus did Wycliffe now sound the first note of doctrinal reform, the consequences of which were to be so far-reaching and so immense.

§ 171. *The Peasant Revolt under Wat Tyler.*—A most important event of this reign was the great insurrection of the labouring classes in this year (A.D. 1381), the result of their deep social misery, brought about partly by the fearful ravages of the "Black Death," and the mischief and demoralization which it had left behind (§ 164), and partly by the series of harsh Acts of Parliament afterwards passed by the dominant landowners in a vain attempt to force down the rate of wages and the price of labour.⁴ But the outbreak itself was largely attributed to the dissemination of Wycliffe's peculiar ideas as to property (§ 164), which were quickly seen by those adopting them to be applicable, if true, not only

¹ See the "Lay Folks' Mass Book," by Canon Simmons (Early Eng. Text Society). See also below, § 272.

² See Appendix F, Roman Corruptions of the Faith.

³ Archdeacon Freeman, "Princ. of Div. Serv." vol. ii., Introd., p. 97.

⁴ The same causes brought about similar outbreaks in Flanders and in France at this very time.

to Church property, but to property of *any kind whatever*, of which the possessors might with equal justice be stripped on the pretence that they were faulty or delinquent. The very arguments which the unscrupulous nobles had gladly used against Church possessions, they now found most unexpectedly turned to justify the spoliation of their own possessions ;¹ and they thus learned a lesson which some in our own day seem to need to be taught again, the great danger of tampering in *any way* with the rights of property, whether sacred or secular. Just as in Wycliffe's time, at the end of the fourteenth century, so now at the end of the nineteenth, the unscrupulous attack upon Church property is rapidly becoming a mere phase of a far vaster Socialistic movement against property of every description—a movement of which we have as yet seen only the beginnings, but which is already filling the minds of thoughtful statesmen with deep apprehension.

§ 172. *Alarm of the Government. The "Earthquake Council." Death of Wycliffe.*—The revolt of the year 1381 was stamped out in blood. But it had effectually alarmed the ruling classes, and alienated them permanently from Wycliffe's cause, checking all possibility of the practical reforms on which he had set his heart, and leading to the proscription of Lollardism in the next reign, and the long consequent postponement of the Reformation. Wycliffe himself, who had no sympathy with the outbreak, now withdrew altogether from politics, and threw himself heart and soul into the novel cause of *doctrinal reform*. His paper against Transubstantiation, published a few months before the Peasant Revolt, had attracted immediate attention, and at once gave rise to keen and eager discussions at the University of Oxford, of which he was so distinguished a member. His weighty arguments, and

¹ John Ball, one of the ringleaders in the rebellion, was a prominent Wycliffite.

the deep learning with which they were supported, exercised a profound and far-reaching effect. In vain Archbishop Courtenay, whose predecessor at Canterbury, Sudbury, a friend of Wycliffe's, had been dragged from the chapel of the Tower of London and murdered by the rebels,¹ obtained, A.D. 1382, the condemnation of Wycliffe's views at the "Council of the Earthquake" (so called by Wycliffe from an earthquake which took place at its first meeting in London). He soon afterwards found it necessary to roughly coerce the very numerous followers of Wycliffe in Oxford, and suppress the growing Lollardism (§ 176) there, by aid of the Royal power. But Wycliffe himself retired in safety to Lutterworth, where, for three years longer, unmolested he poured forth with marvellous profusion tract after tract in vigorous English, and continued his great work of translating the Bible,² till his death from paralysis on the last day of the year 1384.

§ 173. *Wycliffe and Bohemia*.—In A.D. 1382 Anne of Bohemia,³ the "Good Queen Anne," as she was called, had come to England as the bride of Richard II. Like the King's mother (§ 168), she threw the shield of her protection over the bold reformer; and it was doubtless partly owing to her influence that he was left undisturbed in his quiet country parish, where some personal relics of him are still affectionately preserved. His writings quickly found their way into the Queen's native country; and John of Hussinetz, the Bohemian reformer (see § 184), is the important connecting link between Wycliffe and Martin Luther, who in the six-

¹ As Lord Chancellor, "an office especially odious. That insurrection was against the Lawyers, not against the Clergy. 'Pull down the Inns of Court' was the cry."—DEAN MILMAN, *Saint Paul's*, p. 73.

² The second and revised edition of Wycliffe's Bible was set forth eight years after his death by his assistant curate, Richard Purvey.

³ She was the daughter of the German Emperor, Charles IV. (p. 142, n. 3), who had recently died (A.D. 1278); and was sister of Sigismund (§ 183).

teenth century at length started, in Germany, the Reformation itself (§ 201).

§ 174. *Parliament and the Pope. Bulwarks against Rome.*—The repudiation of Wycliffe's novel and revolutionary ideas did not imply any change in the feeling and attitude of the nation with regard to the persistent encroachments of Rome. As in times past, so then, England proved herself a jealous maintainer of her ecclesiastical liberties. An Act of the year 1379 had forbidden foreigners to hold any English benefice. And this was followed by a still sharper blow. The Statutes of Provisors and *Præmunire*, which had been passed in Edward III.'s reign (§§ 161, 162), were re-enacted, a few years after the death of Wycliffe, in a more stringent form, to meet the ceaseless and intolerable exactions that were the outcome of the Papal schism. The new Statute of Provisors in A.D. 1390 (against which the Pope bitterly but vainly struggled),¹ and the new Statute of *Præmunire* in A.D. 1393, forbade, definitely and permanently, all exercise in the one case of Papal *patronage*, in the other of Papal *jurisdiction*, in this country. The latter of these, the *Præmunire* Statute (see § 162), imposed the penalty of outlawry, forfeiture of goods, and imprisonment, on all who obtained Bulls or other instruments from Rome to exercise jurisdiction in England, contrary to the prerogative of the Crown; and it was this memorable law that Henry VIII. put in operation to bring about the fall of Cardinal Wolsey in A.D. 1529 (see § 214). For these important enactments, thus deliberately passed and re-passed by our ancestors long before the Reformation, remained henceforth unaltered upon the statute-book as the law of the land, however often evaded with the connivance of a weak King or Government. How obnoxious these statutes were at Rome, and how strenuous the effort vainly made, as soon as

¹ See Dean Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. v., p. 425, n. 2; and, for the Pope's odious simony, *ib.*, pp. 426, 427.

the Papal schism was over, to get them repealed, we shall see hereafter.

§ 175. *Solemn Declaration of Parliament*.—When in A.D. 1399 Richard II. was deposed by Parliament for tyranny and misgovernment (§ 177), one of the charges brought against him was that he had asked the Pope's confirmation of his illegal acts,¹ whereas (as Parliament proceeded to solemnly declare), “*The Crown of the Kingdom of England, and the rights of the same Crown, and the Kingdom itself, have been from all past time so free that neither the Lord Chief Pontiff [i.e. the Pope] nor any other outside the Kingdom itself ought to interfere about the same.*” (See p. 88, n. 1.) This important public declaration (compare § 161, end), more than a hundred years before the Reformation, would of itself be sufficient to show the absurdity of the far too common idea that the Church of England was ever *Roman Catholic*. She admitted, indeed, at this time, some erroneous doctrines which are still held by the Roman Church; and it was from these that she purged herself (as she had a perfect right to do) at the Reformation.

§ 176. *Rise of the Lollards*.—Wycliffe's followers were quickly known as Lollards. *Loll-harden*, “singing brethren,” and *Beg-harden*, “praying brethren,” were already names of benevolent societies in Germany.² But in England, as soon as the name became identified with heresy, a derivation from “*lolia*,” the Latin word for *tares*, was at once made against them.³ They rapidly grew, however, in numbers and importance, permeating all sections of the community from highest to lowest, and diffusing everywhere the knowledge of Holy Writ through portions of Wycliffe's

¹ Compare the Pope's hostile attitude to English liberty in the reign of John (§ 137) and in that of Henry III. (§ 143). For Richard II.'s bold effort to be rid of Parliament, and his deposition, see J. R. Green, “*Short History*,” pp. 262-264.

² The former dated from A.D. 1309, the latter from about the year 1180.

³ By a similar word-play the Dominicans (§ 140) loved to call themselves *Domini canes*, “the Lord's watch-dogs.”

translation, which, it must not be forgotten, had to be laboriously copied out by hand (the days of printing were not yet), and was therefore very costly. In A.D. 1395 the Lollards were strong enough to present a bold appeal for Church reform to Parliament, fastening it also, for greater publicity, to the doors of S. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey. They objected, we find, to Church endowments ; clerical celibacy ; transubstantiation ; exorcisms and benedictions ; the appointment of clergy to secular offices ; chantries (§ 280), and the excessive number of monasteries ; pilgrimages,¹ and image and relic worship ; auricular confession, and indulgences ; capital punishment ; nunneries ; and all trades that minister to war or luxury. Lollards could be recognized by their grave and solemn aspect, their abhorrence of all swearing,² and their constant citation of Holy Scripture, the touchstone to which they rightly brought all the corruptions which they saw around them. Unfortunately, they attracted to their ranks many of the most unquiet and turbulent spirits of the time : Lollardism became mixed up with the socialistic and revolutionary views which accompanied the rise of the lower classes out of serfdom ; and their sympathy with political discontent brought upon them the suspicions of the Government, and led to the disgraceful period of persecution with which the next century opens.

¹ "Nearly every cathedral and great monastery, and many a parish church besides, had its own famous Saint."—CUTTS, *Middle Ages*, pp. 161, 162. The best-known pilgrimages are those to S. Thomas of Canterbury (§ 130), immortalized by Chaucer ; to the Rood at the north door of S. Paul's Cathedral ; and to Our Lady of Walsingham, on which Erasmus (§ 194) dilates.

² Compare Chaucer, "The Shipmannes Prologue," ll. 1-15.

CHAPTER X

THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY. PREPARATION FOR THE REFORMATION

“ Let knowledge grow from more to more,
 But more of reverence in us dwell ;
 That mind and soul, according well,
May make one music as before,

“ But vaster.”

TENNYSON, *In Memoriam.*

“ How much the more thou knowest, and how much the better thou understandest, so much the more grievously shalt thou therefore be judged, unless thy life be also more holy.”—THOMAS À KEMPIS.

§ 177. *The Lollard Persecution.*—Up to this time there had been no means of repressing heresy in England, except by the slow and cumbrous procedure of the Church courts, which also had in no case the power of inflicting death (§ 121). But on the deposition of Richard II. in A.D. 1399, for misgovernment and for his attempt to rule without Parliament, a different state of things began. The new King, Henry IV., son of John of Gaunt (§ 164), joined hands with Archbishop Arundel against the Lollards; and the iniquitous statute “ *De Hæretico Comburendo* ” enacted that conviction in the Church court for obstinate heresy should be followed by a public *death by burning*. The principle of the violent extirpation of heresy, in spite of some voices of protest (compare p. 106, n. 2) had, from the time of the Albigensian Crusade and the establishment of the Inquisition, passed into universal

acceptance abroad ;¹ and it was now, alas, imported into England. The first to suffer under the new law was William Sawtrey, a London clergyman, who, for his Lollard views in opposition to crucifix-worship, pilgrimages, and, above all, transubstantiation which became henceforth the crucial test as to "heresy,"² was burned at the stake in Smithfield (A.D. 1401). He is memorable as the *first* person (with perhaps one exception two centuries earlier) ever burned in England for heresy.³ Wycliffe's Bible was strictly prohibited by the Archbishop, and rigidly suppressed, on the ground that it was a faulty translation and unauthorized ;⁴

¹ See above, pp. 114, n. 2, 121, n. 3. The Inquisition was formally constituted by Pope Gregory IX. in A.D. 1232, and worked by the Dominican Order, tremendous laws being enacted about the same time by secular princes to crush out heresy by force. S. Thomas Aquinas (§ 141), whose writings the Roman Church places practically on a level with inspired Scripture, throws, as is well known, the weight of his great authority upon the same side. It is his deliberate conclusion that "Those who continue obstinate in their error, after the second reproof [see Tit. iii. 10] are *not only* to be consigned to the sentence of excommunication, but also to the secular princes to be exterminated." See "Summa Th.", Secunda Secundæ, qu. xi., art. 3, "Utrum hæretici sint tolerandi." Contrast S. Matt. xiii. 28-30; S. Luke, ix. 49, 50;

² Thess. iii. 14, 15.

³ See above, §§ 79, 88, 99, 173. "The strongest possible expressions of belief in the real presence in the Eucharist, such as Oldcastle and others were quite ready to make, counted for nothing. . . . If the Lollard could not say that he *believed* that after consecration there remained no longer bread and wine, if he could not say that accidents might exist without a subject, he was straightway burned. . . . And all the time this formula—that bread and wine no longer remain save in their accidents—was entirely a modern dogma, and was not to be found in any of the Fathers."—ARCHDEACON PERRY, *Student's Eng. Ch. Hist.*, vol. i., p. 469.

⁴ An apostate to Judaism was either hanged or burned in A.D. 1222 (Bishop Stubbs, "Const. Hist." vol. iii., p. 353 n.).

⁴ By Archbishop Arundel's Constitutions in A.D. 1408, no translation of the Bible was to be read till approved by the Bishop of the diocese, or by a provincial synod. The existence of such *approved* translations is testified by Sir Thomas More from personal knowledge, and by Archbishop Cranmer in his Prologue to the Great Bible of A.D. 1540. It may be mentioned that Arundel himself, in his funeral sermon on Richard II.'s young Queen, Anne of Bohemia, had specially praised her for her *pious study of the Scriptures*.

and a sharp persecution began of the Lollards, whose name, as we have already seen, their enemies delighted to connect with the Latin word *lolia*, tares, which they declared (by a strange perversion of the teaching of the very parable to which they referred)¹ must be gathered together and *burned*.

§ 178. *Continuance of the Papal Schism.*—Thus in England the fifteenth century opened with a determined effort to put down the new movement for reform which Wycliffe had started. Meanwhile, on the Continent, exciting events took place, and the years 1409 and 1414 are memorable for two attempts, the first unsuccessful, the second successful, to heal the long scandal of the Papal schism.

§ 179. *Council of Pisa. Three Popes!*—Since A.D. 1378 there had been constantly two Popes, living the one at Rome and the other at Avignon, which had been the residence of the Popes for the seventy previous years (§ 169). Each Pope was the furious rival of the other, and stooped to every art to advance his own cause: and Christendom was hopelessly divided on the question which of them was the rightful Pope. At Rome Urban VI. (A.D. 1378), Boniface IX. (1389), Innocent VII. (1404), and Gregory XII. (1406), had succeeded one another, elected by the Cardinals of the one side; at Avignon, Clement VII. (1378) had been succeeded by the Spanish Benedict XIII. (1394), these being successively elected by the Cardinals who preferred residence at Avignon. At length, after many vain attempts, in which the University of Paris took a leading part, to induce or compel the two Popes themselves to close the schism by resignation, the rival sets of *Cardinals* agreed in A.D. 1408 to summon a Council about the matter; and the Council of Pisa, in spite of the efforts of both Popes, met in the following year,

¹ S. Matt. xiii. 24-30. Its importance is shown by our Lord's own detailed exposition of it, vv. 37-43.

Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, and Henry Chicheley,¹ Bishop of S. David's, attending it from England. This Council deposed and excommunicated *both Popes alike* as "notorious schismatics and heretics"; and the Cardinals present elected a new Pontiff, Alexander V., in their stead. But as neither of the Popes in possession would recognize the Council, or bow to its decision, the confusion had only become worse confounded. There had been two Popes before, and now there were *three!* And when Alexander died, A.D. 1410, John XXIII. was promptly elected in his place.

§ 180. *Attacks on Church Property*.—In the House of Commons, where there was a strong Lollard minority² for many years, several attempts were made upon Church revenues in accordance with the views of Wycliffe (§ 164). In A.D. 1410 a sweeping measure was proposed to the King and House of Lords for seizing the temporal goods of Bishops and Abbots throughout the country, a proposal which was at once rejected.³ It should be observed that no attack was even at this time made, or thought of, upon the *spiritualities* of the clergy, *i.e.* the tithes and offerings⁴ which for so long had been, as to a great extent they still are, the endowments of our parish churches. The gross modern fiction that they belong to the State was not yet invented.

§ 181. *Accession of Henry V. Suppression of the alien Priories*.—The main attack upon Church revenues thus signally failed. But the "alien priories," which were mere branches of *foreign* monasteries, founded in dependence on them at the time of the Norman Conquest, were on the petition of Parliament after the ac-

¹ Afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury (§ 186). He was founder of All Souls' College, Oxford.

² Bishop Stubbs, "Const. Hist." vol. iii., pp. 550, 551.

³ Compare Shakespeare, "King Henry V." act i., sc. 1, *init.*

⁴ Bishop Stubbs, *l.c.*, p. 340. See Appendix D, Tithes.

cession of Henry V. in A.D. 1413, confiscated by the King, on the ground that as their revenues went abroad to the parent monasteries in Normandy and France, they helped to enrich the very country with which we were at war.¹ This dissolution of the alien priories (a hundred and ten in number) formed, with the previous suppression of the Knights Templars by Edward II. (§ 158), a convenient precedent for the high-handed proceedings of Henry VIII. in A.D. 1536. Thus does wrong beget greater wrong! So in our own day the confiscation of the property of the Church of Ireland in 1869 has led directly to the still more unjust attack upon the possessions of the Church of England and Wales, which has been so emphatically repudiated by the nation at the recent General Election.

§ 182. *Sir John Oldcastle.*—The most notable victim of the Lollard persecution was Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, a powerful nobleman and skilful soldier, prominent as a supporter of the new views. Being arrested and condemned in A.D. 1413, he contrived to escape from the Tower, and headed an attempt at a Lollard insurrection, of which we know little except that it threw the country into a wild panic, and that it was foiled by the vigour and decision of the young King. Numerous executions of Lollards followed, another severe Act being passed against them (A.D. 1414). Oldcastle himself, who remained in hiding for several years in the wild fastnesses of Wales, was captured in A.D. 1417, and put to a cruel death, being hanged in chains as a rebel against the King, and then burned as a heretic. He met his pitiful and tragic fate with the utmost constancy and fortitude.²

¹ The custom had hitherto been to seize and detain the revenues of the alien priories so long as war lasted (Fuller).

² It is almost superfluous to refer to the noble poem of Lord Tennyson, on the subject of his wanderings in Wales. The surmise that he was the original of Shakespeare's Sir John Falstaff is expressly contradicted by that poet himself ("Second Part of King Henry IV." Epilogue, end).

§ 183. Council of Constance. Close of the Papal Schism.—The scandal of the Papal schism had now become quite intolerable (§ 179), and the new German Emperor elect, Sigismund, took the decisive step of summoning by his imperial authority the important Council of Constance (A.D. 1414), which was attended from England by Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury (§ 179),¹ with the Bishops of Bath, Hereford, and Bangor, and afterwards those also of Winchester, London, Lichfield, and Norwich.² To it came Pope John XXIII., with extreme reluctance and many misgivings. He opened the Council, and presided at its earlier deliberations; but soon changed his mind, and fled from the city in disguise. He was, however, arrested, and fetched back again. The life of revolting infamy which this Pope had led, and the indescribable depravities of which he had been guilty, led to his formal *deposition* by the Council, which also received the resignation of Gregory XII., deposed the third and remaining Pope Benedict XIII., who kept obstinately aloof, and, the way being thus cleared, proceeded to elect a new Pope, Martin V. (A.D. 1417).³ Thus was the long and painful schism finally healed, but only by the revival of the ancient Catholic principle of the supremacy of General Councils, convened by secular princes, as by Constantine and his successors of old—a principle to which the Church of England constantly appeals in her own controversy with the Pope.

§ 184. John of Hussinetz and Jerome of Prague. Communion in one Kind.—The Council of Constance, however, was not a General Council: it represented only a fraction of Christendom (§§ 54, 97). It was this

¹ He died before the close of the Council (A.D. 1417), and lies buried in the Cathedral of Constance.

² Dean Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. vi., p. 19, n. 3.

³ Thirty members of the Council were deputed to act with the twenty-three Cardinals in making the election.

Council which covered itself with infamy by the arrest, imprisonment, and execution by fire of the two Bohemian reformers and followers of Wycliffe,¹ John of Hussinetz² and Jerome of Prague, the former of whom had come to the Council in vain reliance upon the Emperor Sigismund's plighted word.³ It was this Council, too, which passed a decree for the first time formally depriving lay people of the Sacramental Cup. In consequence of this gross mutilation of the Holy Communion, no Romanist layman, strange to say, is even now ever permitted, from the cradle to the grave, to drink of the Cup, of which S. Paul said, "The Cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the COMMUNION of the BLOOD of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16), and of which our Lord Himself said, "Drink ye ALL of it," a command which was obeyed without question throughout Christendom for at least *eleven hundred years.*⁴

§ 185. Yearning for Reform. Attitude of Pope

¹ Not, however, in his later *doctrinal* positions (§ 170), all sympathy with which they expressly repudiated. They were *practical*, not doctrinal reformers : they attacked the vicious lives of the clergy, and the other open scandals of the Church, and particularly (A.D. 1412) the corrupt sale of Papal indulgences (compare § 201) ; and they strove to recall men, as Wycliffe had done (§ 164) to the tribunal of the individual conscience, and the study of the neglected Word of God. The works of Wycliffe were brought from Oxford to Prague by Jerome in A.D. 1402.

² His name was shortened to Hus, i.e. Goose—an abbreviation on which the Reformer himself loved to jest. His public life at Prague had begun in A.D. 1401.

³ John Hus was sent to the stake in A.D. 1415, after a vain mockery of trial : and his devoted friend and adherent, the eloquent Jerome, shared his fate the following year. The Emperor's short-sighted perfidy, due to the strong pressure put upon him by the Council, led immediately to an outbreak of civil war in Bohemia, and ultimately to *two centuries* of desperate religious conflict there.

⁴ The gradual withdrawal of the Eucharistic Cup from the laity began in the twelfth century, and was one of the consequences of the dogma of Transubstantiation (§ 99). It depends on the theory of *concomitance*, which was first distinctly enunciated by Anselm (Ep. iv. 107), and assumes that we know more about the Mystery than we know or can know. It substitutes an unproved *assumption* for the definite and plain direction of our Lord, which it is our wisdom to humbly and thankfully obey. See also below, § 278.

Martin V.—The necessity of a thorough *Reformation* (the very word was freely used) throughout the Church had long before this time (§ 156) become only too apparent, and was sorrowfully admitted and recognized by the wisest and noblest of her children, not only in England, but also abroad. Those who would fain discredit and deny, if they could, the frightful depths of corruption and immorality into which the Western Church had at this period fallen, are silenced and convinced even against their will by the calm, deliberate testimony of the Councils of Pisa and Constance, which confirm the truth of the very strongest and most dreadful statements upon the subject that have ever been made. But the fatal determination to elect a Pope before passing measures of reform had been carried in the Council by the efforts of France, Italy, and Spain, against the better judgment of England and Germany : and the new Pope, Martin V., *declined* altogether that “Reformation in Head and Members” which the Council had agreed was necessary, and had elected him to carry out. He proceeded instead to confirm nearly all the old abuses of the Papal Curia, to revive in his own person the very proudest claims that any of his predecessors had advanced, and to go even beyond them, so that he is regarded as the founder of the Papacy in its most modern phase, as it exists to-day, claiming, in defiance of history, that the Bishops, and even Metropolitans, of Christendom are his deputies, and derive their powers essentially from him.

§ 186. *England and the Pope. Archbishop Chicheley.*—The new Pope soon found himself in collision with the National Church of England. The Statutes of Provisors and *Præmunire* (§ 174), which Henry IV. and Henry V. had reinforced with some further enactments,¹ were sad obstacles in his way ; and he wrote

¹ These were to punish purchasers of Bulls of exemption from tithe
⁷ Hen. IV., *cap. 6*), to restrain foreigners from possessing English

peremptorily to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to *disregard* them altogether on pain of excommunication, and to use every effort to obtain their immediate repeal. He wrote also severely to the English King and Parliament, demanding the repeal of the *Præmunire* statute (the same that Henry VIII. was one day to wield with such effect against the Papacy), on peril of their salvation. Finally, after the death of Henry V., and the accession of his infant son (see below), he deprived the Archbishop of Canterbury of his legatine office (§ 114), excommunicated the Bishops, and threatened an interdict! But all was in vain. The Commons had already voted an address to the King, praying him to uphold the liberties of the Church of England. The Papal Bulls, as contravening the laws of England, were seized on their arrival, and suppressed; and Archbishop Chicheley, who had himself, as Bishop of S. David's (§ 179) been present at the Council of Pisa, *appealed from the Pope to a General Council* (A.D. 1427).¹ The statutes themselves remained untouched and unrepealed even during the coming period of Papal domination.

§ 187. *Reign of Henry VI. Councils of Basle and Florence.*—Henry IV. had died in A.D. 1413, and his son Henry V.'s short reign of dazzling military glory came to an end in the year 1422, when death prematurely called away the gallant young King, just at the height of his power and fame as the conqueror of France,² and sadly ended his long-cherished dream of recover-

benefices (1 Hen. V., *cap. 7*), and to protect incumbents against bearers of Papal "provisions" (3 Hen. V., *st. ii.*, *cap. 4*). Archdeacon Perry, "Student's Eng. Ch. Hist." vol. i., p. 485.

¹ "Wherefore I," are his words, "feeling myself, my position and dignity, and my Church [note the latter expression, and compare pp. 117, 144] to be too heavily oppressed (nimium prægravari) . . . appeal . . . to a sacred General Council representing the whole Church. . ." (See Burnet, "Records," vol. iv.) Compare § 54 above.

² For a vivid portraiture of the times of Henry V., and of the beneficial influences exerted by the Church in these turbulent days, see Miss Charlotte Yonge's story, "The Caged Lion."

ing Jerusalem from the Turks, who in the very year of his decease were swarming round Constantinople itself.¹ And now began for England one of those long, weak reigns which always proved the opportunity of the Popes in this country (§ 94). The new King, Henry VI., was an infant nine months old: and during his long minority, and under his feeble rule, the Papal power, though intensely unpopular, made rapid strides.² The miserable realm of France³ was torn from the English grasp by the peasant heroine, Joan of Arc (A.D. 1429-31); and by the year 1453 all foreign possessions except Calais (§ 305) were finally lost. The violent struggle of Eugenius IV., Pope Martin's successor (A.D. 1431-47), against the earnest efforts of the Council of Basle (A.D. 1431-49) to bring about reforms, was watched with much interest from England, the lower clergy mostly sympathizing with the Council, the Bishops with the Pope. In A.D. 1438 the latter came to a final rupture with the Council, and assembled his rival Council at Ferrara, which was transferred the following year to Florence, and effected a momentary and hollow reconciliation with the Greek Church, as the price of a final effort against the progress of the Turks. In vain the Council of Basle elected an Antipope, Felix V., and lingered on for ten more years. In A.D. 1449 it was obliged to submit to Nicolas V. "All ideas of reformation subsided; the popes continued to exercise and abuse their ecclesiastical despotism."⁴

§ 188. *Pope Nicolas V. Fall of Constantinople.*—The years 1447 to 1455 were occupied with the brilliant

¹ The Turks (§ 106) had obtained a permanent footing in Europe in A.D. 1353, exactly a hundred years before Constantinople fell into their hands (see below).

² In A.D. 1428, at the Pope's command, the bones of Wycliffe were taken from their quiet grave at Lutterworth, burned to ashes, and flung into the stream.

³ See Shakespeare, "King Henry V." act v., sc. 2, ll. 36-60.

⁴ Gibbon, vol. viii., p. 134. England, absorbed in her own affairs, took no part in the striking drama of this Council.

Pontificate of Nicolas V., under whom the famous Renaissance (see below) began, and whose death is said to have been hastened by the shock of the news that CONSTANTINOPLE, for ages the bulwark of Christianity in the East (§ 13, end), had fallen before the terrible Mohammedan Turks (A.D. 1453), in whose possession it still remains.¹ They long continued to be an imminent and dreaded danger to the West: the next two Popes, Calixtus III. (A.D. 1455-8), and Pius II.² (A.D. 1458-64), spent their Pontificates in vain efforts to organize a new Crusade; and the approaching conquest of Italy itself by the Turks was only averted by the fortunate death of the Sultan Mohammed II., A.D. 1481.

§ 189. *Bishop Pecocke and the Lollards.*—The Lollards had now been driven, as the effect of their persecution (§ 182), into a harmless obscurity, in which they remained unmolested, except for fitful and transitory local outbursts from time to time, during the century. We find Bishop Pecocke of S. Asaph,³ a learned and temperate divine, attempting to combat their positions and win them over to the Church practices (see § 176) by calm argument, first in a sermon at S. Paul's Cross, in A.D. 1447, and then in a book which he published two years later under the title, "The Repressing of over miche wyting [blaming] the Clergie." Like most moderate men, he was able to satisfy neither side; his enemies, political and clerical,⁴ took advantage of the stress which in a later work, his "Treatise on Faith"

¹ It was captured by the young Sultan, Mohammed II.; and the body of the last Emperor, Constantine XIII., was found among the slain. The magnificent Cathedral of S. Sophia, the splendid edifice erected by the piety of Justinian (§ 21), became, as it is still, a Mohammedan mosque. Compare § 42.

² Pius II. was the well-known Æneas Sylvius, whose career was so romantic and extraordinary. See "Student's Ecc. Hist." vol. ii., pp. 179, 191.

³ He became Bishop of Chichester in A.D. 1450.

⁴ By denouncing the vices of the friars, the Bishop had drawn down upon himself, like Wycliffe before him, their bitter hatred.

(A.D. 1456), he laid upon the authority of Scripture with Reason as its interpreter,¹ to accuse him of holding Lollard views ; and they forced upon him a public and humiliating retraction. He further offended by appealing to the Pope, and obtaining from him a Bull of protection ; and (so keenly was Papal interference still resented in England) he was thereupon immured in Thorney Abbey till his death in A.D. 1459.

§ 190. *Papal Power in England. "Wars of the Roses."* — Yet, during the latter half especially of this century, it might seem that the Popes had at last securely riveted their power in England. From A.D. 1452 to the close of the century the throne of Canterbury was occupied by three successive Archbishops,² who were actually Roman Cardinals, and mere puppets of Rome, using their utmost endeavours to break down the Church's nationality and bring her into complete subjection to the Pope. Their task was the easier because the attention of the nation was absorbed by the fierce dynastic quarrels which troubled the whole reign of Henry VI., and finally broke out into the long and disastrous civil struggle known as the " Wars of the Roses" (A.D. 1455-85). This great conflict between the rival Houses of Lancaster and York for the Crown is important, because of its results. It brought about the almost complete destruction of the old English baronage, the steady guardians of national liberty since the Great Charter, and thus paved the way for the exaggerated powers of the Crown under the Tudors.³ The night is darkest just before the dawn ; and when Henry VII. came to the throne in A.D. 1485, England and England's Church might seem at last, after so

¹ His position in this respect is a remarkable anticipation of that of Hooker (§ 342).

² John Kempe, Thomas Bourchier, and John Morton (see Appendix B). The first of these was even made, like Wolsey in after days (§ 196), *Legatus a latere* (p. 95, n. 4).

³ Compare pp. 206, 211, 294, n. 2.

many centuries of protest, to have finally passed under the centralized despotism of Rome (§ 97).

§ 191. *The Renaissance. Invention of Printing. Increase of Education. Corruption of the Papacy.*—The fifteenth century, and especially the latter half of it, proved in several distinct ways a most remarkable period of preparation for the Reformation, helping us to understand why, in the mysterious ways of GOD, the efforts at the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, had been permitted to be so fruitless, and the loud voice of reform to die so ineffectually away. Firstly, the advance of the Turks, and the final fall of Constantinople itself in A.D. 1453, sent a flood of refugee Greek scholars and their books to the West, and thus gave an effective impetus to the revival of the knowledge of Greek and of the ancient Greek and Latin authors, and brought about the “Renaissance,” the revival of classical learning,¹ which has proved a veritable turning-point in the history of the human race. The city of Florence from the first became the home and centre of the new learning, which was zealously promoted there by the Medici (§ 201), and at Rome by Pope Nicolas V. himself, who, besides his munificent patronage of scholars, was the founder of the far-famed Vatican Library. The new studies exercised an enormous influence over the minds of men, filling them with new ideas, and freeing them from the yoke of thraldom to the past.² Secondly, the invention of printing, by John Fust and Gutenberg, at Mainz, in Germany (A.D. 1442), provided for the rapid reproduction of books

¹ Leo Pilatus, the preceptor of Boccaccio in the last century, had been the first Greek professor at Florence and in the West (A.D. 1360-3). Manuel Chrysoloras taught at Florence, Pavia, and Rome (A.D. 1390-1415), and was followed by a series of emigrants from the terror or oppression of the Turkish arms (Gibbon, vol. viii., pp. 110 ff.).

² See J. R. Green, “Short History,” pp. 304, 306. As early as A.D. 1431 and 1440 Cardinal Nicolas of Cusa, and Laurentius Valla, had detected the forgery of the famous “Donation of Constantine,” which had so long buttressed up the Papal claims.

just at the time when the need of this was beginning to be most felt. It is difficult for us now to realize that, up to this time in the history of the world, all books¹ had to be laboriously copied out by hand, which of course made them scarce and added immensely to their cost, whereas we are told that in the last thirty years of this century *ten thousand* printed editions of books and pamphlets were published throughout Europe. The new art of printing reached England in the year 1473, when Caxton set up his printing-press at the Almonry, near the west front of Westminster Abbey, under the eager patronage of the Abbot, Thomas Milling, and of King Edward IV. himself. Thirdly, during this century and the preceding one, there were numerous foundations of colleges—religious corporations for prayer and studies—at the two Universities (§§ 129, 141), Oxford and Cambridge,² which, as we shall see hereafter, were destined to take the place, to a large extent, of the older monasteries. Thus, for instance, Henry VI. himself, following the noble example set by William of Wykeham (§ 166) and others, founded the great public school at Eton, and also *King's College*, Cambridge; and his Queen, Margaret of Anjou, in pious emulation of her husband, founded the neighbour college at Cambridge, *Queen's* (now known as *Queens'*, because refounded in A.D. 1465 by the Queen of Edward IV.). Fourthly, just when Rome had succeeded in capturing, as it might seem finally, the Church of England, the Papacy itself sank hopelessly back into the depths of infamy (§ 185) from which the Council of Constance had for a short time rescued it; and its annals become, in the terrible

¹ An exception must be made as regards the wonderful Chinese nation, which had used engraved wooden blocks for printing for many centuries.

² Of the present colleges, three at Oxford and one at Cambridge were founded in the middle of the thirteenth century; four at Oxford and five at Cambridge during the fourteenth century; and the remainder mostly in the fifteenth century. Their basis was essentially *religious*.

phrase of Macaulay,¹ "black with treason, murder, and incest." To the vain and cruel Pope Paul II. (A.D. 1464-71) succeeded Sixtus IV. (A.D. 1471-84), a patron of letters, but corrupt, oppressive, and lustful, as well as notorious for his outrageous nepotism ; his successor, Innocent VIII. (A.D. 1484-92) had seven illegitimate children by different mothers ; and both these Popes were outshone in open and public wickedness by the next Pope, the Spaniard Alexander VI. (A.D. 1492-1503), of whose five children the third, and favourite, was the infamous Cæsar Borgia. The revolting abominations of the Papal Court cannot be further dwelt upon here : but they helped powerfully forward the Reformation movement, and must be remembered in the light of that excessive adulation and exaltation of the Popes which has even dared quite recently to decree that they are "infallible" in matters of faith.² It was on a very wicked and weary world that the light of the Reformation began slowly to dawn. The Spanish Inquisition, a revival from the past (see below, p. 260, n. 2) began its awful career in A.D. 1479, and was reconstituted by Torquemada in 1483, the year of Luther's birth. And already the first low rumblings of the coming tempest might be heard. They came from the city of Florence in Italy, where, in the closing years of this century, the famous Dominican reformer, Jerome Savonarola, Prior of S. Mark's, worked, preached and died.³ The Jubilees of A.D. 1475 and 1500 brought crowds of pilgrims to Rome, eye-witnesses of her shame and her depravity.

¹ "Essay on Burleigh and his Times."

² It may be noted that one of the Popes, Adrian VI., in A.D. 1522 committed himself to this statement : "It is certain that he [a Pope] can err, even in matters that touch the faith, by asserting heresy by his determination or decretal. For many Roman pontiffs have been heretical." The spectacle of an "Infallible" Pope denying Papal Infallibility is extremely awkward for the modern Romanist. Compare above, p. 45, n. 4.

³ He was put to torture and finally executed in A.D. 1498.

§ 192. *Discovery of America.*—There was yet another event which exercised a momentous influence upon the development of the human mind at the close of this century. The startling discovery, by Christopher Columbus in A.D. 1492, of the existence of the New World beyond the Atlantic, utterly revolutionized men's ideas about the earth, and led to an immense widening of their mental horizon. In fact, an altogether new period in the world's history was opening, and men knew it, and even Rome welcomed it, until she found that it meant the overthrow of her long rule over the nations, and the introduction of *liberty of thought* and *liberty of conscience*; and then she turned and became its bitter enemy, instead of setting about the necessary task of quiet, patient, earnest reform.

§ 193. *Henry VII. and the Renaissance. Study of Greek. The "Oxford Reformers."*—No sooner were the weary "Wars of the Roses" ended by the triumphant accession of Henry VII., of the new TUDOR dynasty,¹ A.D. 1485, and his marriage with Edward IV.'s daughter Elizabeth, which united the warring lines, than English scholars began to flock to Italy to take their part in the great revival of letters, which was now providing the human intellect with a new and mighty instrument for rolling away the long accumulated errors and superstitions of the past (see above). One after another the forgotten masterpieces of ancient classical literature, Greek and Latin, were being recovered from dusty monastic libraries, printed, and studied by an enthusiastic throng of scholars. In England the importance of the new knowledge of Greek for *theological* study was quickly realized. Men were no longer dependent, as for ages they had been, upon the Vul-

¹ He was the son of Edmund Tudor, whom Henry VI. had created Earl of Richmond, and the Lady Margaret Beaufort, great-granddaughter of John of Gaunt (§ 164), and the last surviving representative of the House of Lancaster. His father, Edmund, was the eldest son of Owen Tudor, a Welsh esquire, and Henry V.'s widow, Katharine of France.

gate,¹ the Latin *translation* of the Bible (§ 200), much of which, in spite of its general accuracy, had inevitably been misread and misunderstood, when no longer studied with the original.² They could now go direct to the original Greek in which the New Testament was written, and learn from it exactly what our Lord and His Apostles had really said and taught. As soon as they thus studied the original, a mass of erroneous ideas and false meanings, resulting from the long ignorance of the Middle Ages, had to be discarded. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge at once became the natural homes of the new, as they had so long been of the old, learning. In A.D. 1497 John Colet, of whom we shall speak in the next chapter, returned from Italy, and began at Oxford his famous lectures on S. Paul's Epistles, devoting himself exclusively to the task of ascertaining the plain and literal grammatical sense of the original Greek. Two friends of his in particular share his fame, Erasmus (§ 194) and Thomas More (§ 215), and the three are sometimes termed the "Oxford Reformers," because they led the little group of scholars which already, in Henry VII.'s reign, began the task of introducing the new ideas into English life and thought.

¹ *Versio vulgata*, i.e. the version in common use.

² Compare above, p. 123, n. 3.

CHAPTER XI

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. REIGN OF HENRY VIII. EVE OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND

"As the Renaissance re-discovered the valuable elements of the old Græco-Roman culture, so the Reformation re-opened the treasures of the first and purest ages of the Church."—BISHOP OF SALISBURY, Church Congress, 1895.

"We have seen how, in the whole system of the Church, in the teaching of the Schoolmen, in the failure of the Councils, the deliberate refusal of reformation brought to a crisis the elements of revolution, which gathered in a portentous mass from all the various quarters of the social, political, and ecclesiastical horizon. . . . It is well, once for all, to expose the fallacy, that the mighty changes of the sixteenth century could have been caused by any external forces, whether the energy of Luther, the subtlety of Calvin, the tyrannous will and corrupt motives of Henry VIII. Such causes were as inadequate as the command of Canute to the sea; nor could any mere mechanical impulse have been lasting, even if momentarily successful."—*Student's Ecc. Hist.*, vol. ii., pp. 682, 683.

§ 194. *Dean Colet. Erasmus. Archbishop Warham.*—During the early years of the sixteenth century Henry VII. was still upon the English throne. It was a time of very great intellectual ferment (§ 193). We may notice, in passing, the publication of an English translation of one of the great devotional works of the world, the "Imitation of Christ," written in Latin¹ by a

¹ It had been printed anonymously soon after A.D. 1470, and was translated into English A.D. 1502-4. Innumerable editions and translations of this wonderful work have been made both in English and in foreign languages, and its popularity is undying. On its *exclusive* individualism, and strong tendency therefore to religious selfishness, see Dean Milman, "Latin Christianity," vol. vi., pp. 305-306. Compare above, p. 147, n. 1.

German mystic, Thomas à Kempis, about forty years before. Colet, whose lectures at Oxford had brought him such renown (§ 193) was selected by King Henry VII. to be Dean of S. Paul's (A.D. 1505), and he at once began the founding and endowment (in which he generously sank his whole large fortune)¹ of a grammar school there, designed expressly for the study of the new classical lore. S. Paul's School, Dean Colet's foundation, has continued from his time to ours ; it was removed only a very few years ago (A.D. 1885) from its old quarters under the shadow of the Cathedral to the west of London. The creation of this school, with its novel educational methods, excited great remark and interest at the time, and led the way to the foundation of numerous grammar schools on the same plan, from which our modern system of public school education has developed and grown. Among the foremost of Colet's friends was Desiderius Erasmus, a native of Rotterdam, who had come to Oxford in A.D. 1499. A man of vast industry and talents, he speedily made himself a name, and won a European reputation as the most distinguished literary scholar of the day. He was invited to the University of Cambridge by its learned and devout Chancellor, Fisher, then Master of Queens' College and afterwards Bishop of Rochester (§ 230), whose influence with Henry VII.'s mother, the Lady Margaret (p. 172, n. 1), procured the foundation, by her munificence, of the still existing "Lady Margaret" Professorships of Divinity at Oxford and Cambridge,² and also of two colleges at Cambridge, Christ's and S. John's. At Cambridge Erasmus resided for some time as a Professor and teacher of Greek ;³ and it was there that he prepared the elaborate work of which we shall have to speak presently, an edition of the Greek Testament,

¹ Colet was the son of a former Lord Mayor of London.

² The first of the Margaret Professors at Cambridge was Fisher himself.

³ The rooms he occupied at Queens' are still pointed out.

with a new Latin translation, which he published at Basle (A.D. 1516). But apart from this most important Biblical work, Erasmus did much to prepare the way for the Reformation by his witty and scathing attacks on the monks and friars, and on the popular follies and superstitions, such as relic-hunting, saint-worship, adoration of images, religious pilgrimages, and the like (compare § 176). Yet he remained, none the less, the intimate friend and correspondent of the Pope, as well as of a crowd of lesser luminaries, both abroad and in this country. From A.D. 1503 to 1532, a long period of thirty years, the Archbishop of Canterbury was the eloquent and generous Warham, the friend and patron of Erasmus and other scholars of the new learning. Little did he anticipate, in those days of pleasant intercourse and studious excitement, the troubrous times of storm and stress which were at hand for Church and State, and of which his long Primacy was destined to see the beginning.

§ 195. *Accession of Henry VIII. His popularity.*—The accession of Henry VIII. in the year 1509, at the early age of eighteen, was hailed with a burst of loyal enthusiasm amongst all classes, only to be compared with the similar feeling evoked at the accession, more than sixty years ago, of our own beloved Queen at the same early age. Of noble and majestic stature and immense strength, skilled in all arts and accomplishments, and of a frank, hearty, genial temperament, the new King was in every respect a most striking contrast to his father, the cold, elderly, calculating Henry VII.; and he leaped at once into an unbounded popularity with his subjects of every rank and station. He was in warm sympathy also with the new educational movement initiated at Oxford by the little scholar-group of which we have already spoken (§ 193); for Henry himself had been very carefully educated with the view (till his brother's untimely death in A.D. 1502 made him the heir to the throne) of holding high

office in the Church ; and he was thus by far the most learned prince of his age.¹

§ 196. *Thomas Wolsey. His wisdom and tolerance.* —What Thomas Becket had been to Henry II. at his accession, that, and much more, Thomas Wolsey soon became to Henry VIII. The son of a well-to-do tradesman at Ipswich, he had won great distinction at Oxford, and from taking his B.A. degree there at the early age of fifteen became known as the “Boy Bachelor.” In A.D. 1501 he was appointed chaplain to the Primate, and in the year 1506 King Henry VII. made him a Royal chaplain, and eventually Dean of Lincoln. With the young Henry VIII. his influence became rapidly paramount. He was nominated and consecrated Bishop of Lincoln in A.D. 1514, and almost immediately afterwards became Archbishop of York. In the following year, at Henry’s urgent request, Pope Leo X. (see below, § 201) made him a Cardinal, and the King himself appointed him Lord Chancellor (p. 100, n. 1) on the resignation of that office by Archbishop Warham. Finally, in A.D. 1518, he was nominated by the Pope Legate *a latere* in England (p. 95, n. 4). Thus by rapid steps the “butcher’s son” of Ipswich had become supreme both in Church and State, and all authority was concentrated in his hands. Well and wisely he used the enormous powers thus conferred upon him, with a rare and touching fidelity to his master, the King, which nothing could shake, and which shone out mournfully even in the last sad days of his life. But at this time all was bright sunshine : he could afford to despise the bitter hatred of the nobles, who looked upon him as an upstart and an intruder ; for he had the unwavering support and affection of the King. Of his services as a statesman in the thorny and perplexing paths of foreign diplomacy² we cannot

¹ Compare p. 89, n. 1. His favourite author is said to have been S. Thomas Aquinas (§ 141).

² See Professor Brewer, “Reign of Henry VIII.” vol. i., p. 151.

here speak : as a churchman, he is distinguished for his enlightened tolerance, and his wise and noble encouragement of learning.¹

§ 197. *Dean Colet's Sermon.*—Three years after Henry's accession Dean Colet (§ 194) was selected by Archbishop Warham to preach in S. Paul's Cathedral at the opening of Convocation ; and he delivered before the Bishops and clergy of England there assembled a powerful sermon on the crying need of "Reformation" in their own lives and conduct, as the essential preliminary to that of the people at large. He preached—of course in Latin—from the text, "Be not conformed to this world, but be ye REFORMED in the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the will of God, good, well-pleasing, and perfect."² Such a sermon, from one who was known as the leading preacher of the day, made a very great sensation indeed : and, if from Keble's Assize Sermon we may date the "Oxford Movement," in the same way we may perhaps date from Colet's Convocation Sermon the real beginning of a movement for reform in England. From the enemies whom his fearless outspokenness roused against him the great Dean found steady protection in the Archbishop, and also in the young King : he died, however, in the year 1519, too soon to take any prominent part in the coming work of *doctrinal* reform, for which Erasmus and he had done so much to prepare the way.

§ 198. *Reassertion of the Royal Supremacy.*—King Henry VIII., thus firmly seated on the throne, took an early opportunity of reviving and reasserting the powers of the ancient Royal Supremacy, which, though they had never ceased to be the prerogative of the English Kings, both by law and by immemorial custom

¹ Compare the summary of his character given by Shakespeare, "King Henry VIII." act iv., sc. 2, ll. 48-68 : and Professor Brewer's remarks upon it, vol. ii., p. 457. See also below, §§ 203, 206.

² Rom. xii. 2 (Vulgate).

(see § 65), had fallen into some disuse during the long and distracting political turmoils connected with the "Wars of the Roses" (§ 190). The opportunity came in A.D. 1515, when, an Act of Parliament having been passed to restrict to some extent the mischievous privilege of "Benefit of Clergy" (§ 121), Convocation petitioned the King to remit the matter to the decision of the Pope. After a full discussion before him, King Henry refused the request, in memorable words which recall the similar declaration of William the Conqueror (§ 98): "*We are, by the sufferance of God, King of England, and the Kings of England in times past never had any superior but God: know then that we will maintain the rights of the Crown in this matter like our progenitors.*"

§ 199. *Powers of the Royal Supremacy.*—What, then, were at this time the "rights of the Crown," the powers of the Royal Supremacy, thus claimed and constantly exercised¹ long years before there was any thought in Henry's mind of possible quarrel with Rome? The question is thus answered by a learned professor, who devoted years of his life to the long task of studying and arranging in order all the original State Papers of this reign, still preserved in our National archives: "*Convocation could pass no canons without the king's consent; no bull or ecclesiastical constitution could be published in this country without his sanction; no bishop, no abbot, no prior could assume their several offices without the royal permission. As a right, though not always as a fact, the supremacy of the king had continued from time immemorial. The usurpations upon that right were resisted and modified by the energy and will of the sovereign. But in the reign of Henry VIII. the Papal authority in England had ceased to be anything more than a form.*"² In the emphatic words of the late Archdeacon Perry, "That ancient right of the Crown

¹ See below, p. 193, n. 1, and Index, s.v. Supremacy.

² Professor Brewer, "Reign of Henry VIII." vol. i., p. 253.

of England to be imperial¹ within its realms, which William I. had asserted and used; which Henry II. had never relinquished in all his great struggle with the Church; which the first and third Edwards had claimed and caused to be respected—the right which so many Parliaments had enunciated and confirmed, which lies at the root of the Statutes of Provisors, *Præmunire*, and many more—was not a sudden discovery made by Henry when the Pope would not grant him his divorce, but a principle which he had long before deliberately adopted.”²

§ 200. *Edition of the New Testament by Erasmus.*
Martin Luther.—In A.D. 1516 the famous scholar Erasmus (§ 194) published at Basle his edition of the New Testament in the original Greek, with important expository notes and a new version in Latin. The old Latin version—the Vulgate—as revised and set forth at the end of the fourth century by S. Jerome (p. 357), had now for ages been in sole use (§ 193), and, though after all only a version, had by degrees (like the English Authorized Version in our own time) come to be looked upon as itself sacred and inspired; it remains to this day the standard Bible of the Church of Rome (§ 338). The New Testament of Erasmus, however, with the fresh light that it threw upon the Scriptures, received a warm welcome from Archbishop Warham and the other English Bishops. One of them, Bishop Fox of Winchester, the generous founder of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, enthusiastically declared that the new version was worth ten commentaries. It was widely and thoughtfully studied, not only abroad,³ and at the English Universities, but in English households and at the English Court: and it gave a very great impetus to the Reformation. In England it brought

¹ Compare above, p. 88, n. 1.

² “Student’s Eng. Ch. Hist.” vol. ii., p. 24.

³ “It is said that one hundred thousand copies were sold in France alone.”

light, among others, to Thomas Bilney, the Cambridge reformer (burned at Norwich in A.D. 1530),¹ who, while studying it, found in the precious text, "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," the message for which his soul craved :² abroad, it helped to clear the troubled mind of Martin Luther, an Augustinian friar who had been appointed (A.D. 1508) Professor of Philosophy at Wittenberg, in Germany, by the founder (in A.D. 1502) of the new University there, Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony.³

§ 201. *Commencement of the Reformation in Germany.*—On All Saints' Eve, in the memorable year 1517, Dr. Martin Luther, of whom we have just spoken, indignant at the open sale by a Dominican friar, Tzetzel, of Papal *indulgences*,⁴ in order to raise money for the completion of S. Peter's at Rome, nailed to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg⁵ his famous ninety-five theses, directed against the corrupt teaching current as to indulgences, and the assumed Papal power of forgiveness on which they were based.⁶ The moment was well-timed, as pilgrims were flocking into Wittenberg from all parts for the coming festival: and the excitement produced by Luther's manifesto was immediate and very great. A furious controversy at once began with the Dominicans, in which Luther found an earnest supporter in the gentle

¹ Compare § 312 below.

² 1 Tim. i. 15. (Bagster's "English Hexapla," p. 14.)

³ Erasmus had no sympathy with the peculiar views afterwards developed by Luther in his recoil from the mediæval creed: and the two were engaged, later on, in bitter controversy, especially on the subject of Free Will.

⁴ *I.e.* documents from the Pope purporting to convey, for a money consideration, remissions of *punishment* for sins committed. See Appendix H, p. 331.

⁵ The usual process in announcing subjects for academical disputation.

⁶ It is remarkable that seven years earlier an important paper of *Gravamina* had been drawn up in Germany against certain Roman abuses, and among them this of indulgences. Compare also above, p. 163, n. 1.

and learned Philip Melanchthon, henceforward his lifelong friend and counsellor. The Pope at this time was Leo X. (A.D. 1513-21), a son of the Lorenzo de' Medici, who, as ruler at Florence, had gloried in the patronage of the new literary movement, the Renaissance (§ 191) : and as Pope he conjoined an easy-going selfishness and good humour with the munificent patronage of literature and art which distinguished his house. He smiled at the first news of the quarrel between the German friars : but in A.D. 1520 he found it necessary to intervene, and issued a Bull of condemnation against Luther, who, for his part, about the same time published his three primary works, boldly attacking the whole fabric of the Papal power and developing his reforming views. Relying on the powerful support of his own Sovereign, Frederick the Wise, Elector¹ of Saxony, Luther proceeded to publicly *burn* the Papal Bull, with a copy of the decretals and of the canon law, and thus completed his breach with Rome (December, A.D. 1520).²

§ 202. *Henry VIII's Book against Luther.*—The writings of Luther were eagerly studied at the two English Universities, and made many converts there. Cardinal Wolsey as Papal legate was urged to take severe measures against the spread of the new doctrines, but having a strong and noble aversion to religious persecution, contented himself with a public burning of the obnoxious books in London (A.D. 1521). The immense influence which Luther had already gained is strikingly shown by the fact that the King of England, himself a divinity student of no mean order (§ 195, end), now condescended to enter the lists of controversy against the miner's son, the friar of Wittenberg.

¹ By the famous Golden Bull of the Emperor Charles IV. in A.D. 1356 (p. 142, n. 3) the right of electing the German Emperor henceforth was vested in seven "Electors," viz., the rulers of Bohemia, Saxony, Brandenburg, and the Palatinate, and the three Archbishops.

² See further, § 246 below.

Henry VIII.'s "Assertion of the Seven Sacraments against Martin Luther" was published in Latin (A.D. 1521): some splendidly bound copies of it were presented to the Pope, who in return conferred upon the English King the title which still appears upon our coins, *Fidei Defensor*, "Defender of the Faith," a title already granted before to Henry IV. for his zeal against the Lollards.¹

§ 203. *Wolsey and the Monasteries.*—It was to the spread of *education* that Colet and Erasmus and their friends had looked for the gradual extirpation of the follies and superstitions of the times (§ 194). It was to the same means that Wolsey now looked to check the novel Lutheran views, by raising up a learned clergy able to meet and confute what was erroneous in them by sound argument. Hence he now took a very remarkable and important step, to which we must next direct our attention.

§ 204. *Former Utility of the Monasteries.*—The monasteries in England had long outlived their original usefulness. In earlier days they had been of immense service in many ways. They had provided places of secure retirement and quiet devotion for women, and also for men—for the scholar, the student, and the recluse—through the boisterous ages of violence and strife, when outside the walls of a monastery men's lives and women's honour were very lightly regarded. By their patient industry the monks reclaimed vast tracts of land, and literally made the wilderness to blossom as the rose. By their laborious copying out and correction of manuscripts they kept alive even in the worst times of barbarism the sacred flame of learning, and in their libraries preserved the Holy Scriptures and the treasures of ancient literature safe through the ages of ignorance. And they provided

¹ Luther's published reply to the King was extremely bitter and violent, and was answered from England by More and Fisher. See also p. 218, n. 3, below.

originally the sole existing schools to which the young could be sent for teaching. Nearly every monastery had attached to it a *free school* for the benefit of the surrounding neighbourhood, the most promising scholars of which were sent up to the Universities ; and thus many a poor man's son climbed up to high office in Church and State.¹ Also the monasteries supplied to a large extent the want of hostels for the traveller, and hospitals for the sick. And they played an extremely important part in the relief of the poor, at a time when there were no infirmaries, no work-houses, no poor-laws, but when anyone knocking at the gate of a monastery was sure of obtaining shelter or alms.

§ 205. *Failure of the Monastic System.*—But the dark ages of ignorance were passing away, and the monasteries must pass away with them. The foundation of colleges and schools (§ 191) had taken the work of education largely out of their hands. The invention of printing had made the painful efforts of their scribes in the copying and illuminating of manuscripts no longer of use. Their great work of reclaiming barren lands had long been done ; and they were now simply landlords of vast sweeps of fertile country, which owed their productiveness to the earlier labours of the monks. The wealth, the idleness, the uselessness of the monks had long since passed into a by-word, while scandal was incessantly busy about their luxury and their frivolity. Worse scandals still were not unheard of ; and that they were, to say the least, not wholly unfounded is proved by, for instance, the searching visitation of English religious houses ordered

¹ A striking instance, one out of very many, is the career of Bishop Grosseteste (§ 142). The restoration of some such regular educational ladder is only now being attempted. And scholarships and exhibitions founded at our Universities for the maintenance of poor students are too often awarded, by a gross anomaly, not to the poorest, but to those who by an examination-test are found to be *best educated*, i.e. (other things being equal) to the sons of the wealthy or well-to-do !

by the Pope and carried out by Archbishop Morton in A.D. 1489, twenty years before Henry VIII. came to the throne, and the miserable state of dissoluteness, immorality, and corruption in which the monks of S. Alban's, the great Abbey which was one of the foremost in England, were then found to be. All the monasteries at this time were deeply encumbered with debt, and the financial condition of the smaller ones was almost desperate (compare § 243 below).

§ 206. *Wolsey's treatment of the Monasteries. Cardinal College.*—Under the circumstances it was becoming widely felt that the system of monasticism was entirely effete.¹ To meet the changed conditions of the times, Wolsey proposed, following the precedent set in some of the educational foundations of Henry VI.'s reign, to suppress the smaller and more useless of the monasteries, and use their revenues to better purpose by founding schools and colleges, and additional Bishoprics, of which, owing to the increase of the population, there was great need. No fresh Bishoprics had been founded at all since the reign of Henry I. (§ 112). Accordingly, in the year 1523, he obtained Bulls from the Pope, and Royal letters patent from the King, to suppress forty of the smaller monasteries for his projected new foundations, a great public school in his native town, Ipswich, and a magnificent college at Oxford to be called after himself, "Cardinal College."² In A.D. 1528-9 he procured further Bulls, authorizing him to change monastic foundations into Bishoprics, and his intention was to found in England no less than

¹ No new monastery had been founded for very many years; and it is on record that, when Bishop Fox proposed to found one, Bishop Oldham induced him to found a college at Oxford instead (§ 200), pointing out that the monastic system was likely to be soon swept away altogether.

² After Wolsey's fall Cardinal College was refounded (on a smaller scale) by the King, and its name changed to Christ Church. This is still the leading college at Oxford, as Trinity College, Henry's other foundation, is at Cambridge.

twenty-one new sees. This immense scheme was frustrated by his fall the following year, and although his grand projects were ultimately carried out to some extent by Henry VIII. after his rupture with Rome, instead of Wolsey's far-sighted plans for turning the surplus revenues to good account and employing them for useful and religious objects, nearly all the immense sums obtained by the King, when in the memorable years 1536-40 he demolished the monasteries and confiscated their revenues, were devoted to his own use or frittered away in lavish gifts to his courtiers (see § 274).

§ 207. *Tyndale's New Testament.*—In A.D. 1526 another long step towards the Reformation was taken. William Tyndale, a distinguished young Oxford and Cambridge scholar, and one of those who had eagerly studied the Latin New Testament of Erasmus, had resolved to undertake the work of translating the New Testament into *English*, that, to quote his own famous words—themselves an echo from the preface of Erasmus—even “the boy that driveth the plough” might be able to hear and understand the Scriptures. He completed the onerous task in poverty and constant danger abroad: and thus was produced the first English version since that of Wycliffe (§ 170). Three thousand copies of it were printed at Worms, smuggled across into England, and, in spite of all attempts to seize and destroy them on the ground of “unfair renderings and mischievous glosses of the Word of God,”¹ they were widely circulated among the poorer and the trading classes, with the tracts of Wycliffe and of Luther and his followers. This was the work of a secret society of earnest doctrinal reformers who called themselves the

¹ “It was not as a mere translation of the Bible that Tyndale's work reached England. It came as a part of the Lutheran movement; it bore the Lutheran stamp in its version of ecclesiastical words;”—and, we may add, in its intemperate annotations—“it came too in company with Luther's bitter invectives and reprints of the tracts of Wyclif.”—J. R. GREEN, *Short History*, p. 352. Compare above, p. 158, n. 4.

“Christian Brotherhood,” and who longed to see the Church purged of those unscriptural accretions to the Faith which were possible only because the Bible had so long been a closed book. Wycliffe’s version had done much in his own time : but his English was now antiquated and partially obscure, and the version, having been made before the invention of printing, was very scarce. Moreover, it had been translated not from the Greek, but from the Vulgate, the Latin version of the Roman Church (see § 200). Tyndale’s translation, on the contrary, was made direct from the original Greek : and our present Authorized Version is only the result of successive revisions and corrections of the noble version of Tyndale, the “true primary version,” as the preface to the Revised New Testament of A.D. 1881 rightly calls it.

§ 208. *Progress of Reforming views in England.*— Thus was the long-sealed Word of God thrown open for all to read by Tyndale’s labours, which did for the mass of the people what the Latin version of Erasmus had done already for the educated. All the efforts made to seize and suppress the new version failed ; and reforming principles rapidly spread throughout the country. And yet how dim and distant must have seemed at that time the hope of a Reformation in England ! The King and the Pope were firm friends : the latter had decorated the former with his title “Defender of the Faith” for his work against Luther ; and nothing could have seemed less likely than a conflict or quarrel between the two. Yet *only a quarrel between Henry and the Pope* could open the way for those doctrinal reforms for which so many were longing, and enable the Church of this country to take in hand the great and pressing task of Reformation, from which the Church of Rome so impatiently and persistently turned away.

CHAPTER XII

REIGN OF HENRY VIII. (CONTINUED). REPUDIATION OF ROMAN JURISDICTION IN ENGLAND

“Because with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad ; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life¹ : therefore ye shall see no more vanity, nor divine divinations : for I will deliver my people out of your hand.”—Ezek. xiii. 22, 23.

“Viewed as a whole, the Reformation was a chequered movement made up of good and evil. Scarce any of the actors in it had altogether clean hands. Scarce any of the proceedings were without some stain or alloy. While we glory in its results, and rejoice in the amazing benefits it has conferred on Church and State, we may not lose sight of the questionable character of some of its history.”—ARCHDEACON PERRY, *Student's Eng. Ch. Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 12.

§ 209. *All things ready for the Reformation.*—This, then, was the position of affairs in England. The lower classes were permeated with the teaching of Luther, of Wycliffe, and of the New Testament itself, and eager, many of them, for a thorough reform in Church doctrine and practices. Of the higher classes, many largely sympathized with Luther and his views, and many others (among whom was Cardinal Wolsey) were hoping by the foundation of new schools and colleges to raise up a more learned clergy able to discern between the good and the evil in the new views. All men were looking for a change and a resettlement, on account of the recent awakening from ages of ignorance which the Renaissance had brought about. And there was only one great obstacle in the way, the

¹ Compare Appendix H.

friendship between the English King and the Roman Pontiff. That obstacle it pleased God to remove in a most unexpected manner, by overruling, as He so often has done, the wicked desires of sinful men to the accomplishment of His own sovereign plans. In the very year after Tyndale's New Testament had appeared, the idea of Henry's divorce was first entertained. To comprehend aright that much-misunderstood episode of history, the divorce proceedings of Henry VIII., we must revert for a moment to the reign of his father, Henry VII.

§ 210. *Henry VIII. and Katharine of Aragon.*—In A.D. 1501 Spain and England were alike anxious to check the growing might of France, and the powerful Spanish monarch, Ferdinand of Aragon, therefore consented to wed his daughter Katharine to Henry VII.'s eldest son Arthur,¹ then Prince of Wales and heir to the English throne. But Prince Arthur died, less than six months after their marriage, of consumption, or of some epidemic of the time: and then Spain, still keenly anxious for the English alliance, proposed a union of the widowed Katharine with her deceased husband's brother, Henry, who was now, by the demise of his elder brother, heir to the throne which he afterwards ascended as Henry VIII. (§ 195, end). Such a marriage was, of course, directly contrary to the law of God (Lev. xviii. 16) and of the Church: but it was supposed that a dispensation from the Pope could override this obstacle. The necessary dispensation was refused by Pope Alexander VI. (§ 191); and Archbishop Warham (§ 194) was always strongly opposed to the projected union: but at length, in A.D. 1504, Julius II., the determined enemy of France, was prevailed upon to sanction it, and as soon as Henry VIII. ascended the throne, he therefore cemented the Spanish alliance

¹ Named, as we are expressly told, after the old hero-King of the British race, King Arthur (§ 20), from whom the Tudors, as *Welshmen* (p. 172 n.), claimed a fabulous descent.

by marrying the widowed princess, who was five years older than himself.

§ 211. *The rise of scruples.*—For many years they lived happily together : she was devotedly fond of him, and proud of his gallant bearing and kingliness, his fame abroad and popularity at home. But from the first a curse seemed to hang over the marriage : child after child was born only to die (Lev. xx. 21) ; and in place of the male heir for whom Henry longed, to secure the stability of his throne and the tranquillity of the realm after his death, the only offspring of the ill-omened union that survived was a little girl, Mary, afterwards the famous, or rather infamous Queen. Katharine being considerably Henry's senior had become, in 1526, the year of Tyndale's New Testament, a faded elderly woman, while he was still in the prime of manly vigour. We can hardly be surprised to find that doubts and scruples entered his mind—suggested indirectly, there is considerable evidence for thinking, by Cardinal Wolsey,¹ who planned to wed Henry to a French princess—as to the validity of the dispensation for his marriage so reluctantly granted from Rome. We know, what he suspected, that a Pope has no power to abrogate at his own will the law of God, though many nowadays seem to have the impression that an Act of Parliament can do so, if we may judge from the “Divorce Act” which since 1857 has disgraced our statute-book and shamed our national Christianity² (p. 310), and from the persistent efforts still being made to “legalize” marriage with a deceased

¹ Partly through the French embassy for Mary's hand in A.D. 1527, and partly through the King's confessor, Longland, Bishop of Lincoln. Wolsey's scheme for replacing the alliance with Germany by an alliance with France was entirely frustrated by the development of the King's fatal passion for Anne Boleyn, of whom Wolsey had taken no account.

² The Divorce Court has been recently called “an absolute sink of perjury, corruption, and collusion.” It is working untold harm and injury to English morality, and to that home-life on which, as all history warns us, the stability of a nation depends.

sister's husband. *No human power, whether of Pope or Parliament, can alter the Divine law, or make the transgression of it anything but a sin and a crime.*

§ 212. *The King and Anne Boleyn. Application to the Pope.*—The King of England's scruples about his marriage, if aroused by the arts of Wolsey and his own longing for a male heir, received a fresh and unexpected stimulus from the fascination exercised over him by Anne Boleyn, a young Maid of Honour in attendance on the Queen, and niece of Wolsey's great enemy, the Duke of Norfolk. She had first appeared at Court in A.D. 1522, in her sixteenth year, with the freshness of her girlish beauty and gracefulness enhanced by a recent residence at the Court of France. The first idea of the divorce arose in Henry's mind as early as the year 1524; the direct efforts to bring it about began in A.D. 1527; and in the following year the mission of Cardinal Campeggio to England to try the case with Wolsey made it notorious throughout Europe. What Henry requested of the Pope was not a divorce, strictly speaking; though a plausible pretext for even this would, under ordinary circumstances, have been invented without difficulty, for so powerful a King, by the corrupt and compliant Court of Rome.¹ What he demanded, however, was simply a declaration of nullity of marriage, on the ground that the dispensation granted for it by Pope Julius II. had been *ultra vires*, beyond the power of the Pope to grant, and therefore invalid. Henry regarded the marriage with his brother's wife as having been *void from the first*, because contrary to the law of God: and his original purpose was to decide the matter for himself in the English courts. From this course he was dissuaded by Wolsey, who was afterwards bitterly blamed by the Pope himself, in

¹ Only a few years before a wholly unjust divorce and remarriage had actually been granted, for a consideration, to the King of France (A.D. 1498). The case of the Princess of Monaco in modern times (A.D. 1869) is well known.

the awkward position in which he found himself placed in consequence.

§ 213. *The Pope and the Emperor. Abortive trial in England.*—The Pope was indeed in a most awkward predicament. Personally he was ready and even anxious to oblige the English King. But Katharine, the Queen, had a still more powerful nephew, Charles V., who, on the death of his grandfather Ferdinand (§ 210) in A.D. 1516, had succeeded to the throne of Spain, with its possession of Naples and of the vast wealth of the New World; and three years later had also become, in succession to his other grandfather Maximilian, ruler of Austria and the Netherlands, and eventually Emperor of Germany. To affront the Queen of England was to affront this all-powerful Continental Sovereign, and the unhappy Pontiff had thus to choose between offending the King of England and insulting the still mightier potentate of Germany and Spain. And just at this very time the Emperor, already offended with the Pope for absolving the French King, Francis I., from his solemn oath to observe the Treaty of Madrid (A.D. 1526), allowed a body of troops, partly German, partly Spanish, to assault and sack the city of Rome itself, and make the Pope virtually a prisoner (May, 1527): and though, after six months, the trembling old man escaped from Rome in the disguise of a gardener, he felt himself to be quite helpless against the Emperor's power. Hence the vacillation and hesitation, the long and intricate negotiations and delays and promises in which he took refuge, and which, ending in nothing after all, gradually wore out the patience of Henry. Even when at last the Cardinals Campeggio and Wolsey sat, in open violation of the law of *Præmunire*, as Papal delegates in England to try the case (A.D. 1529), and the King of England stooped to the strange humiliation¹ of appearing publicly before

¹ See Professor Brewer, "Reign of Henry VIII." vol. ii., p. 344.

them, the Cardinal Campeggio was under strict though secret orders from the Pope on no account to pass sentence. Accordingly, when every pretext for delay had been exhausted, and, after long months of expectation, the time had come for a definite sentence, Campeggio coolly rose and adjourned the court : the cause had already, under imperial pressure, been revoked by the Pope to Rome.

§ 214. *Fall of Wolsey*.—At the very moment when, after long delays, Henry was expecting complete success, the cup was dashed from his lips. The revulsion of feeling was too great ; and in his rage and bitter mortification he turned savagely on the minister whose advice had turned out so disastrous, and who was naturally suspected—for Anne Boleyn, as we have seen, was no friend of his—of lukewarmness in the cause. Wolsey's fall was dramatically sudden and complete : and he found scant sympathy in any quarter, for he had alienated all hearts by his ambition, his excessive love of pomp and display, his unpopular taxation, and his yet more unpopular policy of alliance with France. He had openly broken the law of the land, the Statute of *Præmunire* (§ 186),¹ by exercising in England jurisdiction as a Papal legate ; and the fact that he had done so with the King's own consent made no difference when legal proceedings were taken against him, for even the King has no power to permit a subject to break the law!² Still, Henry's conduct towards Wolsey, as towards Katharine herself, was both brutal and detestable—none the less so because

¹ So far was this famous law from being, as is sometimes said, obsolete, that it was in constant use to curb the ecclesiastical courts, when there was any danger of their collision with the ordinary courts of the realm. For the special aggravation in Wolsey's case, see p. 95, n. 2.

² Wolsey, however, could have pleaded a licence under the Great Seal, which he had taken the precaution to obtain. It may be noted that the Provisors Statute of A.D. 1390 (§ 174) actually contains a clause providing for the punishment of any, cleric or lay, who *induced the King to violate it*.

it was within the strict lines of the law. In vain reliance on his Royal master's mercy, Wolsey, already dismissed from the Chancellorship (§ 196), signed a paper pleading guilty in the matter of *Præmunire*; and thus all his vast possessions became at once by law forfeited to the Crown. Among the rest was seized his magnificent London residence, York Place (the name was now changed to *Whitehall*)¹ and became henceforth a Royal palace. After some months of suspense, the fallen minister received a free pardon and permission to retire to his diocese of York (A.D. 1530). But the restless machinations of his enemies, afraid of the possible revival of his former influence over the King, brought about his sudden arrest the same year for *treason*: a harmless correspondence with France—to obtain the French monarch's intercession with Henry—had been discovered and turned against him by his bitter foe, the Duke of Norfolk (§ 212). This fresh shock absolutely killed him: he breathed his last, on the way to the Tower of London, at Leicester Abbey. With him ends the grandeur and splendour which had gilded the earlier years of Henry's memorable reign.²

§ 215. *Sir Thomas More.*—Wolsey had been succeeded in the Chancellorship of England by a layman, Sir Thomas More, one of the group of early Reformers at Oxford in the preceding reign (§ 193). His wit, learning, and abilities had brought him very great renown both abroad and at home: in A.D. 1516 he had published his famous sketch of a Socialist system, "Utopia," i.e. "Nowhere-land" ("Nusquamia" he sometimes calls it in his letters), a book which is still read for its clever anticipations and discussions of the perplexing social and political problems of modern times, and shows him as endowed with all the instincts of a great statesman:³

¹ Compare Shakespeare, "King Henry VIII." act iv., sc. 1, *ad fin.*

² Professor Brewer, "Reign of Henry VIII." vol. ii., p. 448.

³ It was written in Latin, and quickly translated into French and other Continental languages, but not into English till A.D. 1551.

in A.D. 1523 he was, on Royal nomination, elected Speaker of the House of Commons. In his private character and home life Sir Thomas More was pure and gentle and most lovable. But his short Chancellorship, in striking contrast with that of Wolsey (§ 202), was disgraced by a sharp persecution of the English followers of Luther, four of whom were burned (A.D. 1530-2): and he carried on a very violent and bitter literary war with Tyndale and others of extreme Reforming views abroad.

§ 216. *Thomas Cromwell. Dr. Thomas Cranmer.*—The two most prominent figures of the reign after Wolsey's fall were Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer, who both come first into notice shortly after the disgrace of Wolsey. Thomas Cromwell must, of course, be carefully distinguished from the still more noted *Oliver Cromwell*, who lived a century later. Beginning life as a blacksmith's son at Putney, he had, after a life of roving adventure abroad, become Wolsey's confidential secretary, and his instrument in carrying out the dissolution of certain small monasteries (§ 206). He remained unswervingly faithful to his master when all others forsook him, and thus recommended himself to Henry, and by his versatility and genuine ability quickly rose into high favour, and for the next ten years guided the counsels of the King. Thomas Cranmer was a Doctor of Divinity at Jesus College, Cambridge, who attracted the Royal notice by some sensible advice in the vexed question of the divorce (A.D. 1529). There was at this time a complete deadlock, the Pope having, at Katharine's appeal, cited the case to Rome, while Henry was determined never to plead there. The course suggested by Cranmer was simply to fall back entirely on the authority of the Word of God, without further reference to the Pope; to obtain from the Universities a formal statement that marriage with a deceased brother's wife was contrary to the Divine law (Lev. xviii. 16); and then to annul the

marriage, as a matter of course, in the English ecclesiastical courts (compare § 212, end). The bold advice found favour with Henry: the Cambridge Doctor was soon afterwards made a Royal chaplain, and he became, next to Cromwell, the King's principal adviser.

§ 217. *Meeting of the Reformation Parliament.*—In the autumn of A.D. 1529 the famous "Reformation Parliament" assembled,¹ which, little as men then expected it, was destined before its sessions closed to strike off from Church and State the last shackles of Papal domination (§ 245). Some minor ecclesiastical abuses were first corrected, the heavy fees for probate of wills and for burials being lowered, and the holding of pluralities, *i.e.* more than one benefice at a time, by dispensations from Rome forbidden. But the Parliament was soon to pass on to far more important work.

§ 218. *The Universities and the Divorce. Proclamation against Papal Bulls.*—Acting on Cranmer's suggestion (§ 216), Henry obtained, in A.D. 1530, from some of the foreign Universities opinions condemnatory of marriage with a brother's widow; and from the English Universities, Oxford and Cambridge, he wrung vague and qualified declarations in the same direction, but with very great difficulty,² public opinion being, as might be expected, strongly on the side of the injured Queen. Next followed a remonstrance to the Pope, signed by the Lords, including the Bishops (Wolsey himself signed it as Archbishop of York), and by the most eminent of the House of Commons, protesting against his long delays, and calling upon him in accordance with the opinions of the Universities, to annul the marriage. The Papal reply proving, as usual, inconclusive, a

¹ Except for one short session, no Parliament had been assembled for fourteen years. On the importance of Thomas Cromwell's resuscitation of Parliamentary government, see J. R. Green, "Short History," p. 350.

² They would only affirm the illegality, if the marriage had been actually consummated, which the Queen had constantly denied. Compare § 210.

Royal proclamation was issued in September, making the introduction of Papal Bulls into England penal.

§ 219. The Royal Supremacy formally acknowledged by the Clergy.—Having thus exercised one of the powers of the Royal Supremacy, as it had been exercised, e.g. by William the Conqueror (§ 98), the King felt the importance of obtaining a definite and clear acknowledgment of his rights from the clergy, who had been of late accustomed (§ 190) to look unduly to the Pope. A curious piece of sharp practice was resorted to for this purpose. The clergy and the whole nation, by acquiescing without protest in the legatine authority of Wolsey, lay, it was said, under the penalties of the *Præmunire Statute*, which had a clause concerning abettors; and, by the decision of the Judges, their property and persons were at the Royal mercy. Parliament, as representing the nation, went through the farce of suing for and obtaining a pardon: the Convocations, as representing the clergy (§ 148), were required, before receiving their pardon, to pay a very heavy fine, and also to formally acknowledge the King as “supreme head of the Church of England.” This, after long debates and negotiations, they consented to do, with the important qualifying clause, “so far as is permitted by the law of Christ,”¹ and with definite explanations from the King that *spiritual* supremacy was not intended.² Thus, though there was not as yet any breach with Rome, Henry VIII. gathered together the powers of the ancient Royal Supremacy, in readiness for use against the Pope, should it be necessary (compare § 198).

§ 220. Submission of the Clergy in the matter of

¹ “Quantum per Christi legem licet.” Compare below, § 233.

² “The King wrote at some length, and in an argumentative and conciliatory tone. He denied, indeed, the position which (according to him) the [Northern] bishops had taken up, that the jurisdiction of princes and of priests was co-ordinate, the one being over temporal things and the other over spiritual. The power and jurisdiction of the prince was over both; and ecclesiastical persons were under him on the

Canons.—In the following year (1532) another important step was taken. The House of Commons, in which a very bitter feeling against the clergy at this time found expression, voted an address to the King, known as their “*Supplication against the Ordinaries*,” complaining, among other things, of the power of Convocation to make ecclesiastical laws, which became then binding on the realm without consent required of Crown and Parliament. This practice the Convocations were now obliged to give up, and to agree that no new canons should thenceforth be made without the Royal licence and assent, just as no new laws can be made by Parliament without the Royal licence and assent. This very important arrangement had the effect of reducing Convocation to its proper constitutional position as the Church’s Parliament (§ 147) under the Crown, a position from which it had gradually drifted in the days of Papal domination. The restriction remains in force to this day, like the similar restriction on the proceedings of Parliament itself.

§ 221. *The ancient Canon Law still in force.*—Henceforth, then, no ecclesiastical canons might be made by the Convocations except with the Royal assent. But the canons already existing, all the old canon law of the English Church, remained unrepealed; and the attempt at revision in the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth (resulting in the celebrated “*Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*”) having come to nothing, they remain to this day legally binding in our courts, when not contrariant to English statute law. The statute of A.D. 1534 (§ 227) itself expressly provided this,¹ and it has been repeatedly acted upon

one hand, as the civil magistrates were under him on the other. But he meant no intrusion into the sacerdotal functions. *Only so far as spiritual things included property and justice*, whatever power was necessary to preserve the peace of society was comprehended in the commission borne by the supreme ruler.”—CANON DIXON, *Hist. Ch. Eng.*, vol. i., p. 67. See further, below, pp. 204, n. 1, 207, 213.

¹ “Such canons, constitutions, ordinances, and synods provincial

accordingly by the English Judges. It forms one more important and obvious witness to the unbroken continuity of the Church of England, the “Ecclesia Anglicana,” before and after the Reformation.

§ 222. *The Annates Act.*—The Annates Act passed in this year (1532) abolished the payment of “annates,” i.e. the firstfruits of sees and benefices (§ 157) to the see of Rome, and thus relieved the English clergy of a costly and burdensome impost, by which enormous sums were continually being wrung from England. The Act was suspended till Easter, A.D. 1533, in the hope that the Pope might voluntarily come to terms in the matter; but it contemplated, and provided for, the possibility of a rupture with Rome. The relief to the clergy did not last long: at the close of the year 1534 the firstfruits and tenths of all benefices were bestowed by Parliament upon the King; and a fresh and stricter valuation of every benefice and every ecclesiastical preferment was made by commissioners specially appointed in every county.¹ This revenue continued to be regularly drained from the Church, though sorely impoverished in other ways, as will hereafter appear, till A.D. 1704, when Queen Anne generously gave it up to be used for Church purposes, and thus started the fund still known as “Queen Anne’s Bounty,” which, largely supplemented by the bequests and donations of Church people since, is applied mainly to the augmentation of small livings. Those who have so much to say about sums voted to the Church by the State (as though a *giver* had any right to claim back his gifts!) forget altogether, or at any rate forget to mention, the

being already made, which be not contravened, nor repugnant to the laws, statutes, and customs of this realm, nor to the damage or hurt of the king’s prerogative royal, shall now be still used and executed as they were afore the making of this Act.”—25 Hen. VIII., cap. 19 (confirmed by 1 Eliz., cap. 1).

¹ The previous valuation had been made by order of Pope Nicolas IV., in Edward I.’s reign (A.D. 1291). The “*Valor Ecclesiasticus*” of Henry VIII. is still existing.

enormous sums which have been from time to time extorted *from* the Church by the State, and especially, as we shall see, during the Reformation crisis.

§ 223. *Death of Archbishop Warham.*—On the same day that the “Submission of the Clergy” was signed, Sir Thomas More, the Lord Chancellor, withdrew from office, and retired into private life, a sign of quiet disapprobation which intensely annoyed the King (§ 230). In August the aged Warham died, who for thirty years had presided over the Church of England (§ 194, end) and who from his death-bed protested against the statutes, already passed or impending, to the Church’s harm. As successor to the Archbishop Henry nominated his favourite chaplain, Cranmer (§ 216), a man who, in spite of much weakness of character, was destined to prove one of the best and most valuable in all the long series of our Primates from S. Augustine. Three months later the King, weary of the interminable delay, and considering his marriage with Katharine *ipso facto* void, because within the forbidden degrees (§ 212), secretly married Anne Boleyn.

§ 224. *The Statute of Appeals. Consecration of Cranmer.*—The Statute for the Restraint of Appeals, passed early in the year 1533, swept away all right of appeal from courts within the kingdom to Rome (compare §§ 102, 162). Its famous preamble declares in emphatic words that “*the Crown of England is imperial,¹ and the nation a complete body within itself, with a full power to give justice in all cases, spiritual as well as temporal, to all manner of folk, without restraint or appeal to any foreign prince or potentate; the body spiritual thereof having power, when any cause of the law divine happens to come in question or of spiritual learning, to declare and interpret by that part of the body politic called the spirituality, now being usually called the*

¹ Compare §§ 105, end, 198, end.

English Church, and there have always been in the spirituality men of sufficiency and integrity to declare and determine all doubts within the kingdom, without the intermeddling of any exterior power." It proceeds to allude to the legislation of "Edward I., Edward III., Richard II., and Henry IV.", by which they had "preserved the liberties of the realm, both spiritual and temporal, from the interference of Rome" (compare §§ 65, 114). Shortly afterwards, at the end of March, Cranmer was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury by the Bishops of Lincoln, Exeter, and S. Asaph. The customary Bulls were obtained from Rome for the occasion, and the usual heavy prices for them demanded and paid. Cranmer, in taking the prescribed oath of canonical obedience to the Pope, made a protestation, still existing in his episcopal register, that he "intended not by the oath to bind himself to do anything contrary to the laws of God, the King's prerogative, or to the commonwealth and statutes of the kingdom."¹ We who know of the events that followed afterwards, in criticising the conduct of Cranmer, are apt to forget that there was no rupture with Rome as yet—nothing had been done which other English Kings had not equally done in the past—and there was at this time still every reason to believe that a complete breach would be averted by timely concessions from the Pope, and especially by the powerful mediation of the King of France.

§ 225. *The Divorce pronounced. Coronation of Anne Boleyn. Birth of Elizabeth.*—After a final consultation with his Convocation, Cranmer proceeded as Archbishop to determine, under the Statute of Appeals, the long suit as to Henry's marriage with Katharine. He held a court at Dunstable Priory, with the Bishop of Lincoln as assessor, while Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester (afterwards so prominent in Mary's reign), and

¹ See Appendix J, Cranmer's Oath.

others appeared formally on the King's behalf: and he there pronounced his sentence annulling the marriage as invalid from the first.¹ Five days later he confirmed at Lambeth the marriage already contracted by the King with Anne Boleyn (§ 223); and, on June 1st, publicly crowned her as Queen amid great public rejoicings. So ended this long and painful episode.² In the following September Elizabeth was born, afterwards the famous Queen; and Archbishop Cranmer was godfather at her baptism.

§ 226. *Attitude of the Pope.*—On hearing of Cranmer's sentence, the Pope on his part declared it null and void: whereupon the King appealed formally from him to a future General Council, just as Archbishop Chicheley had done a hundred years before (§ 186). That all might understand what had happened, this formal appeal was placed on the door of every church in England, together with the recent legislation forbidding appeals to Rome. And so matters rested during the remainder of this year.³

§ 227. *Legislative enactments. The appointment of Bishops.*—The following spring (A.D. 1534) saw several Acts passed of great importance. Foremost came the statute of "Submission of the Clergy," ratifying the arrangement already agreed to between the clergy and the King two years before (§ 220), that the Convocations, like Parliament, should henceforth be summoned by the Royal writ, and should put forth their canons only with the Royal licence and assent. Next, the statute of the preceding year, forbidding appeals to

¹ The Queen refused to recognize the court, as she had appealed to Rome.

² The unfortunate Lady Katharine retired to Kimbolton Castle. She died there early in A.D. 1536, and was buried in Peterborough Abbey Church, which, perhaps partly for this reason, was spared by Henry VIII., and became a Cathedral (§ 274, below).

³ The impostor, Elizabeth Barton, the "Holy Maid of Kent," with her confederates and accomplices, was apprehended in November, and executed the following April.

Rome, was confirmed ; and power of final appeal was given from the Archbishop to ecclesiastical commissioners specially appointed in each case as a Court of Delegates by the Crown.¹ The election of Bishops was now regulated by reverting to the practice of earlier days ("as hath of old been accustomed" are the actual words of the Act), by which the Bishop was elected by the Cathedral chapter, the person to be elected being first nominated by the Sovereign (see § 161). This usage was finally re-established under Elizabeth, and has continued in use down to the present day. With all its advantages, this method of Royal choice (§ 65) has some grave disadvantages : it seriously injured the Church, for instance, in the Stuart, and again in the Georgian, period. It will probably have to be altered or modified in some way before long, in fairness to the Church, now that the power and influence of the Prime Minister of the day have become all but paramount with the Crown, while there is no guarantee nowadays that the Prime Minister should be (as the Sovereign still by law *must* be) a member of the Church of England. The Queen, however, as is well known, takes very great pains in the choice of our Bishops ; and her Prime Ministers, of both parties alike, have so far been loyal members of the Church. And if only, by the general return of Dissenters to the Church of their fathers, we regain that *national religious unity* which is now so sadly lost (§ 15), this difficulty, a great and growing one at the present time, will pass away of itself.

§ 228. *Act concerning "Peter's Pence" and Dispensations.*—Another Act of this session abolished the payment of "Peter's Pence" (§ 98) and the lucrative Papal traffic in dispensations and licences, and settled on its legal basis the jurisdictional powers exercised by the two

¹ In A.D. 1833 the powers of this Court of Final Appeal in ecclesiastical cases were too hastily transferred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, an arrangement which has worked very badly, and imperatively requires modification. Compare § 101.

Archbishops.¹ In memorable words this Act formally declares that "*the King and Parliament did not intend by it to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church² in any things concerning the very Articles of the Catholic faith of Christendom, and in any other things declared by Scripture and the Word of God necessary for their salvation*"—words which exactly express that which remained the guiding principle of the English Reformation throughout its whole course.

§ 229. *Repeal of the Heresy Statute. John Fryth.*—Next, the terrible statute of Henry IV. "De Hæretico Comburendo," which had slept since its employment against the Lollards (§ 177) was repealed by Parliament (to be revived, alas, hereafter under Mary), and it was enacted that offenders must have a public examination and trial in the ordinary law courts, and not be executed without a special Royal warrant obtained beforehand. This was in consequence of the strong feeling aroused by the recent condemnation and burning of John Fryth, a distinguished Cambridge scholar and friend of Tyndale, who, having ventured back to England, had been arrested by Sir Thomas More during his Chancellorship (§ 215), and was burned alive in A.D. 1533 for his views on the Eucharist,³ a shocking prelude to the similar proceedings both in this and, above all, in Mary's reign.

¹ The *spiritualities* (in the legal and technical sense of the word) of a Bishop are, of course, essentially distinct from his purely *spiritual* offices or functions, such as Ordination, Consecration, or Confirmation. With the latter, as inherent in the very office of a Bishop, no interference was possible or contemplated. Compare pp. 197, n. 2, 213.

² See the opening words (often misunderstood) of Article xix.; the words used at the Reception of the Child in Holy Baptism; and the remarkable words in the Homily against Contention, near the beginning.

³ The treatise against Transubstantiation, which he wrote from his prison in refutation of Sir Thomas More, marks the literary re-commencement in England of the "terrific controversy on the nature of the Presence in the Sacrament, which was already convulsing the Continent, and was destined to fill all Europe with blood and flame for a century to come."—CANON DIXON, *Hist. Ch. Eng.*, vol. i., p. 166.

§ 230. The Succession Act. Fisher and More committed to the Tower.—The last measure passed at this time was the Succession Act, which fixed the succession in the children of the King and Anne Boleyn, thus excluding Katharine's daughter Mary (§ 211) from the throne as illegitimate, and ordered that all should take the oath of allegiance accordingly. Two prominent men, Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher, though willing to swear to the succession, took exception to the wording of the prescribed oath, probably as implying a renunciation of Papal supremacy.¹ Both were already under suspicion as sympathizers with Queen Katharine and upholders of the Papal cause, and they were now committed to the Tower. Their subsequent fate will come before us hereafter.

§ 231. Repudiation of Roman Jurisdiction in England.—While Parliament was thus busy making laws what had the Pope been doing? He had already declared Cranmer's sentence in England void (§ 226); and in March of this year, 1534, after long hesitation, and only because a courier expected from Henry with fresh proposals arrived *two days too late*, he issued, under the pressure of the imperialists, his sentence, pronouncing that Katharine's marriage was lawful and valid, and that the English King must by all possible means be compelled to live with her again. No wonder the perplexed Pope had so long hesitated. As soon as the news of this insult to the Crown reached England, the Bishops (§ 218), the Convocations, the Universities, and the whole spirituality of the Church of England renounced the usurped jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. Even in the darkest times of his domination in England, it had been a usurpation, uncongenial to the instincts of Englishmen, and continually protested

¹ “ . . . and not to any other within this realm, or foreign authority, prince, or potentate. And in case any oath be made or hath been made by you to any other person or persons, that then ye do refute the same as vain and annihilate . . . ” They wisely refused, however, to say definitely in what their objection consisted. See § 236.

against : and now it passed utterly away (see § 273 below).

§ 232. *The Supremacy and Treason Acts.*—In the autumn of this eventful year Parliament reassembled in a fervour of indignant loyalty : and it proceeded to pass two laws, placing in the hands of Henry VIII. terribly potent instruments of tyranny which he was not slow to use both in Church and State. The first of these was the Act of Supremacy ; the second was the Treason Act.

§ 233. *The Act of Supremacy.*—Three years before, Henry had obtained from the English clergy a definite acknowledgment of his Supremacy, guarded by the important clause “so far as is permitted by the law of Christ” (§ 219). But the Supremacy Act now passed by Parliament went far beyond the proper and constitutional exercise of the Royal Supremacy, and transferred it, for the time, into a crushing despotism. The qualifying clause on which the clergy had insisted was omitted ; and the King, recognized as “the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England,” was empowered as such to “visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought to be or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended.” This led the way, as we shall see, to very serious exaggeration of the powers of the Supremacy. It remained in force for twenty years ; and was repealed under Queen Mary. And it must be carefully noted that the objectionable, because misleading, title, “Supreme Head,” was never revived. The English Sovereign is NOT now, and never since the days of Queen Mary has been, styled “Supreme Head ” of the Church of England, but “Supreme Governor ” of that as of all other societies, and all persons, within the realm (see below, § 308).

§ 234. *The Royal Supremacy as explained by the Authorities.*—The real exercise of the Royal Supremacy, as always admitted and practised in England, before as well as since the Reformation, is seen in the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth in A.D. 1559: “Her Majesty neither doth, nor ever will challenge any authority, than that was challenged and lately used by the said noble Kings of famous memory, King Henry the eighth, and King Edward the sixth, which *is, and was of ancient time* due to the Imperial Crown of this Realm, that is, under God to have the Sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her Realms, Dominions, and Countries, of what Estate, either Ecclesiastical or Temporal soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them.”¹ So Henry VIII. himself explained the new title in his letter to the Northern Convocation, A.D. 1531, in reply to the fears expressed by Bishop Tonstall of Durham (see p. 197, n. 2). So Cranmer, at his trial in Mary’s reign, indignantly denied that he had ever advocated the title of “Supreme Head of the Church” in any other sense than as expressing that the King was *head of the people in the land, whether ecclesiastical or lay.* As our thirty-seventh Article (at the end of the Prayer-Book) expresses it, “Where we attribute to the Queen’s Majesty the chief Government, by which Titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended: we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God’s Word, or of the Sacraments; the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen, do most plainly testify; but that only Prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all Estates and Degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and

¹ See the whole passage in Bishop Sparrow’s “Collection of Articles,” etc., p. 83.

restrain with the Civil Sword the stubborn and evildoers.—The Bishop of Rome *hath no jurisdiction* in this Realm of England.”¹

§ 235. *Its Essential Point.*—Thus far as to the Royal Supremacy, which is so constantly misrepresented and ignorantly carped at by the enemies of the Church of England, but which resolves itself into this, that the Christian ruler, and not a foreign Bishop, is to be supreme in jurisdiction over his Christian subjects (§ 65). Elementary as this truth may seem to us now, it was emphatically the point at issue with Rome for centuries; and, though placed carefully in the background, it is the point at issue with her still. The Royal Supremacy means, ultimately, religious liberty: the Papal Supremacy means bitter bondage. Englishmen have tried both: and the results are writ deep in our country’s history.

§ 236. *The Treason Act. Execution of Fisher and More.*—Thus was the Royal Supremacy over the Church, which had existed in England, as in other Christian States, from the very first, definitely reclaimed and reasserted. The Treason Act, which quickly followed, armed the King with a terribly potent instrument to silence opposition. It extended the awful penalties of *high treason* to all writings, or even malicious speech, against any Royal dignity or title: and any who, when officially *questioned*, refused their assent to the Supremacy were held, by a shocking stretch of the law, to come within its provisions. Among the first victims of this most atrocious statute were the noble Carthusian monks, the monks of Charterhouse,² blameless in their lives, heroic in their deaths. Next came

¹ Compare Hooker, “Ecc. Pol.” bk. viii., ch. 8.

² *I.e.* Chartreuse—see § 115. The site of their London monastery had formerly been a cemetery in which fifty thousand victims of the “Black Death” of A.D. 1349 (§ 164) had been interred. In A.D. 1611 Sir Thomas Sutton, having purchased the property, founded the famous “Charterhouse” school.

the aged and venerable Bishop Fisher and the world-renowned Sir Thomas More, who had been lying in prison at the Tower of London since their refusal to take the succession oath (§ 230). Bishop Fisher (§ 194) had been Queen Katharine's confessor : in A.D. 1529 he had boldly gone before the legatine court and delivered his sentiments about the divorce, thus drawing down upon himself the bitter wrath of the King. Sir Thomas More had marked his disapprobation of Henry's ecclesiastical proceedings by resigning the Lord Chancellorship in A.D. 1532 (§ 223) : and he had significantly absented himself from the coronation of Anne Boleyn, a slight which she never forgave him. In May, A.D. 1535, a new Pope, Paul III., further exasperated the King by offering to Bishop Fisher, as he lay in the Tower, a Cardinal's hat.¹ "The hat might be sent him," said Henry grimly, "but he would take care there should be no head for him to wear it on." In June and July Fisher and More were separately arraigned under the new Treason Statute, condemned, and beheaded on Tower Hill.

¹ The *red hat*, as a peculiar appendage of Cardinals, dates from the Council of Lyons in A.D. 1245. The proffered honour was declined by Fisher. English feeling in this matter was always very strong. Thus in A.D. 1417 King Henry V. (§ 187) refused to allow Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester, to become a Cardinal, declaring that he "had as lief set his crown beside him, as to see him wear a Cardinal's hat." And even in the next reign, after obtaining his Cardinalate in A.D. 1426, the Bishop had a narrow escape of *Præmunire*. Contrast § 190.

CHAPTER XIII

REIGN OF HENRY VIII. (CONCLUDED). DESTRUCTION OF THE MONASTERIES. PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION ABROAD AND AT HOME

“Henry VIII. was wonderfully fitted for the work which he had to do. His popularity, his learning, his vigour, his imperiousness, nay, his very vices, were overruled for great providential purposes. His ability and learning led him to write against Luther, and hereby to fix men’s attentions on the truths which Luther advocated. His strong self-will led him to break with the pope, and thereby to erect, as it were, a barrier to protect the very opinions which he himself denounced. He chose to give the country an open Bible, and thereby to render impossible the partial reformation which his laws enacted. He assumed in anger against the pope a title (that of supreme head of the Church) which, properly interpreted, forms the true palladium of the liberties of the Church of England. He thought to check the Reformation by his Six Article law, and hereby imposed a restraint upon it which made it more complete and perfect. His financial necessities led him to destroy the monasteries, and thereby to take a step without which progress, either in Church or State, would have been impossible. All the necessities and requirements of his position, all the strong impulses and overpowering capacities of his character were made to serve for special good.”—ARCHDEACON PERRY, *Student’s Eng. Ch. Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 11.

“In this country the best people and the worst combined in bringing about the Reformation, and in its progress it bore evident marks of both.”—SOUTHEY, *Life of Wesley*, ch. ix.

§ 237. *The Church of England freed from Roman Control.*—By the remarkable series of events detailed in the previous chapter, the ancient Church of England, unreformed as yet, recovered her former independence of Rome, and with it the power of entering upon that path of sober and Scriptural REFORM which we shall find her soon beginning to tread. That the

Church, not only in England, but throughout Western Christendom, grievously needed a reformation, had long since been again and again acknowledged, but the persistent and urgent efforts to bring it about *through Rome* had all ended in complete and hopeless failure (§ 187).

§ 238. *Rule of Thomas Cromwell.*—King Henry VIII. had now, under the cool and systematic guidance of Cromwell, become transformed, little by little, from the popular and genial monarch (§ 195) to a ruthless despot. From the passing of the Treason Act (November, A.D. 1534), until the fall of Cromwell (June, A.D. 1540), for nearly six long years England was under a kind of reign of terror. Her liberties for the time seemed completely crushed ; and the tyranny was none the less real because exercised under strictly legal forms and with the co-operation of Parliament.¹ Cromwell's spies were busy everywhere ; and the intense fear and hatred which he inspired were manifested only when the spell was at length broken by his fall from power.

§ 239. *Indignation abroad. Reginald Pole. English Bishops on the Supremacy.*—The news of the recent executions in England, and, above all, those of Fisher and More, excited great horror and indignation on the Continent. The furious Pope drew up a Bull of deposition against Henry : but it was not as yet published, in deference to a strongly-worded protest from the King of France. But Reginald Pole, an Englishman of the highest rank, the King's own cousin,² who had taken refuge in Italy after writing against the divorce, and who was afterwards made by the Pope a Roman Cardinal, now put forth a bitter Latin treatise, "For the Defence of Ecclesiastical Unity." It is noteworthy that this treatise was answered from England by Tonstall, Bishop of Durham, Gardiner, Bishop of

¹ See J. R. Green, "Short History," p. 350.

² Pole was of Royal blood by both parents, his father being a cousin of Henry VII., and his mother, the Countess of Salisbury, niece of Edward IV.

Winchester (§ 225), and Bonner, then Archdeacon of Leicester, who were all, as well as Cardinal Pole himself, so prominent afterwards in the reign of Mary. For, it must be carefully observed, the repudiation of Roman control over the Church of England had nothing whatever to do with the growing movement and desire for *doctrinal reform* (§ 208). Reformers and anti-Reformers were all at this time alike agreed in the repudiation, after centuries of protest, of the alien jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome (§ 231). King Henry himself was, to the end of his life, in his personal views and practices what would now be termed a Romanist, save only for his rejection of Papal Supremacy.

§ 240. *Coverdale's Bible*.—The October of the year 1535 is memorable for the publication, under express Royal sanction, of Coverdale's Bible, the first *authorized* English Bible, due to the powerful influence of Cromwell with the King. The national demand for the Scriptures had become too great to be resisted. A translation had already been half-promised by Sir Thomas More in a proclamation during his Chancellorship (A.D. 1530); and Latimer had then written his celebrated letter to King Henry, with whom he was a great favourite (§ 262 below), about allowing the Scriptures in the English tongue. At the end of A.D. 1534 Convocation itself petitioned the King for a new translation by "honest and learned men"; and the Archbishop seems to have then made an earnest attempt to apportion the work among the English Bishops. The important task was however taken in hand, at the request of Cromwell, by Myles Coverdale, a Yorkshireman, educated at Cambridge, and a friend and follower of Tyndale. He carefully revised and incorporated Tyndale's version so far as that had been completed,¹ and translated the rest of the Bible—including, of course,

¹ Viz., the New Testament, published in A.D. 1526 (§ 207) and very carefully revised in A.D. 1534; the Pentateuch, published early in the year 1530; and the Book of Jonah in 1531.

the Apocrypha or Ecclesiastical Books¹—himself, not indeed from the original, but “out of Douche and Latyn,” as he quaintly says on the title-page, *i.e.* from Luther’s German version (§ 246 below) and the Vulgate.² The English version thus published with the King’s permission was rapidly circulated and eagerly bought up, together with a Reformed manual of private devotions, known as “Marshall’s Primer.”

§ 241. *Cromwell Vicar-General.*—In the autumn of this year Henry issued an instrument appointing Cromwell his Vicar-General, or deputy in ecclesiastical matters, and granting to those whom Cromwell should nominate sweeping powers of visitation and correction, which fortunately were never actually used except against the monasteries (see below). The jurisdiction of the Bishops was suspended during the visitation; and it was restored to them under Royal licence and during the Royal pleasure, a special clause safeguarding their purely *spiritual* rights and functions,³ which, of course, were not interfered with.

§ 242. *Attack on the Monasteries.*—The monasteries of England were very numerous and very wealthy; they owned at this time, it has been calculated, about

¹ See Hooker, “Ecc. Pol.” bk. v., ch. 20. The quite modern practice of omitting these books altogether from our ordinary Bibles is much to be deprecated. Written by pious Jews in the period between the Old Testament and the New, they form a valuable link between the two, and, though not applied “to establish any doctrine,” because never part of the inspired Hebrew Canon, they have been continually read in the Church “for example of life and instruction of manners” (Art. vi. at end of our Prayer-Book), being found in the ancient Greek version of the Bible, the Septuagint, from which the New Testament writers have mainly quoted, as the version commonly in use in our Lord’s time. These instructive writings used to be always included in our Bibles, and were very dear to the Reformers: the Book of Homilies, for instance, is full of allusions to, and quotations from, them, in striking contrast to the undeserved neglect with which they are now too commonly treated.

² The first Bible translated direct from the original Hebrew and Greek texts was the Great Bible of A.D. 1539 (§ 263 below).

³ “Præter et ultra ea quæ tibi ex Sacris Litteris divinitus commissa esse dignoscuntur.” See Canon Dixon, “Hist. Ch. Eng.” vol. ii., pp. 168 n., 413. Compare above, pp. 197, n. 2, 204, n. 1.

a fifth of the whole kingdom. They had long since obtained, most of them, from the Pope the fatal grant of exemption from the control of the English Bishops, which, while it made them strongholds of the Papal power in England, left them eventually a prey to unchecked disorder of every kind, and seriously weakened their connection with the National Church. Though venerable relics of a most useful past, and quite capable of being re-invigorated under proper management, they had for centuries become homes of notorious ease and luxury, and not seldom open vice as well. The reclaiming of the land, the foundation of colleges and schools, and the invention of printing, had taken away the most important of their ancient functions, and robbed them of much of their utility (§ 205 above); and we have seen Cardinal Wolsey's wise and farsighted plan, which he had begun to carry out when he fell, of turning the monastic wealth into more useful channels by the foundation of fresh colleges and Bishoprics, in spite of great clamour and much adverse comment.¹ His schemes were now taken up by Cromwell and Henry VIII., but in a very different spirit. It had long been recognized that the monasteries were doomed—that they must sooner or later be lopped off from the Church of England as a branch that had ceased to bear fruit.² But the temptation came to Henry, and he succumbed to it, of using their revenues to replenish his own treasury, as Henry V. had already done in the case of the alien priories in A.D. 1414 (§ 181), but on a far more extensive scale.

§ 243. *Visitation of the Monasteries. The Black Book.*—As a first step, a visitation of all the monasteries was undertaken, in the autumn of A.D. 1535, by commissioners appointed by Cromwell as Vicar-General. From their reports was compiled the famous "Black Book," which was laid before Parliament early in the

¹ See Fraser Tytler's "Life of Henry VIII." p. 212.

² See p. 185, n. I.

year 1536, together with a bill for the suppression of the smaller houses. This "Black Book" was carefully destroyed afterwards, in the reign (it is supposed) of Mary; but there is no doubt that it was to a great extent a tissue of lies. It is known that the commissioners, and Cromwell himself, freely took bribes; the visitation only lasted three months; and all kinds of scandalous stories against the inmates of the monastic houses were hurriedly raked together without any proper investigation of their truth. Yet there is abundance of independent evidence that many monasteries, especially among the smaller ones, had long since lost their original character, and had become mere dens of vice. They had also so seriously dwindled in numbers, that some contained only four or five resident members, and some only one.¹ The great monastery of Ely contained, it is said, only fourteen resident members at this time, instead of seventy. And very many of these old foundations had for years been hopelessly insolvent (§ 205, end).

§ 244. Suppression of the Smaller Monasteries.—Whatever the exact condition of the monasteries may have been, Parliament, in February, A.D. 1536, with great reluctance, and only after long and bitter debate and even a personal threat from the King, passed the momentous Act which granted to the Crown *all monasteries unable to show a clear annual income of more than £200 a year*, as well as any which by voluntary surrender,² or otherwise, might be dissolved within a year. Under this Act three hundred and seventy-six religious houses were destroyed, a Court of Augmentation of the King's Revenue being established to carry it out.

§ 245. Close of the Reformation Parliament. Execution of Anne Boleyn.—This was the last Act of the "Reformation Parliament" (§ 217), which was at length

¹ Proclamation of the King to the Lincolnshire rebels in A.D. 1536.

² As early as A.D. 1531 the Priory of Christ Church nigh Aldgate had thus come into the hands of the King.

dissolved in April. The following month Queen Anne Boleyn, who had done much in her high position to forward the Reformation movement, suddenly lost the Royal favour, and was brought to trial and condemned to death. Her marriage was then annulled, on grounds only obscurely known to us :¹ and in spite of a brave intercession by Cranmer on her behalf, the beautiful young Queen, mother of a yet more famous daughter (§ 225), was beheaded on a trumped-up charge of adultery and treason, Jane Seymour taking her place in Henry's affections as his third wife.

§ 246. *Germany and the Reformation. The Protestant League.*—Before following the monasteries to their final ruin, we must turn back for a moment and see what the foreign Reformers had been doing during these momentous years. In the month after Luther's excommunication by the Pope (§ 201, end) he was summoned by the young Emperor Charles V. (§ 213), to answer for his contumacy before the Diet at Worms ; and thither he went, with the reckless courage which was his great characteristic, at the risk of his life (April, A.D. 1521). All the efforts made, in this brilliant assembly of princes and nobles of the whole German Empire, to overawe the poor friar of Wittenberg and shake his firmness, proved futile ; and the closing words of his famous speech still thrill the heart : “ *Hier stehe ich : ich kann nicht anders : Gotte helfe mir. Amen.* ”² He found shelter for ten months in the Castle of Wartburg, under the protection of his steadfast friend, the Elector of Saxony (§ 200),³ in spite of the imperial ban

¹ The pretext put forward was a pre-contract with Lord Percy, but the real clue may probably be found in the words of Pole : “ Thou hast married a woman whose sister had been thy mistress.” There are other circumstances which point to a former illicit union between the King and Mary Boleyn. On whatever ground, the annulment was pronounced by Cranmer, and ratified by Convocation.

² “ Here stand I : I can none other : God help me. Amen.”

³ This famous Reforming prince was an ancestor of Prince Albert, the Consort of our own Queen Victoria.

pronounced against him for the sake of Papal support against France.¹ There he began his translation of the New Testament into German, which was published in A.D. 1523. (His version of the whole Bible appeared ten years later.) In A.D. 1524 came a very violent controversy with Erasmus (p. 181, n. 3); and in the same year began the Swiss movement for Reform at Zürich, under Zwingli, whose unhappy errors as to the Eucharist were destined to do much to shipwreck the whole Reforming movement abroad.² In A.D. 1525 Luther protested in a very practical way against the enforcement of celibate vows by his famous marriage with Katharine von Bora, a former nun. In the following year, that of Tyndale's New Testament (§ 207), the Emperor, having a quarrel with Pope Clement VII. (§ 213), consented, at the first Diet of Spires, to a compromise in the direction of religious toleration. But this he revoked in 1529, the year of Wolsey's fall, when the reconciliation of Emperor and Pope was cemented by the renewed enforcement of Roman doctrine. It was against this retrograde movement that the Reforming princes of Germany united in that great *protest*, from which their famous historical name PROTESTANTS is derived. Formulating their religious belief in the "Confession of Augsburg," which was drafted by Melanchthon, and presented by them to the Emperor at the Diet of Augsburg (A.D. 1530),³ they drew together in a defensive military league. The imminent outbreak of civil war was only averted by the sudden irruption into Hungary of vast hosts of the

¹ It was in October of this year that Henry VIII. received from Leo X. his title of "Defender of the Faith" (§ 202); and in December the Pope died. His successor Adrian VI. (A.D. 1522-3) is memorable not only as the last German Pope, but as a Pope who emphatically *denied* the figment of Papal Infallibility. See p. 171, n. 2.

² Zwingli, unlike Luther, held the Eucharist to be merely a commemorative ordinance, and evacuated it of all sacramental efficacy. Compare below, pp. 252, 325, 342.

³ The Confession of Augsburg became henceforward the *Lutheran* standard of doctrine.

advancing Turks,¹ which forced the Emperor to come to terms, for a time, with the Protestant portion of his subjects by the Peace of Nuremberg (A.D. 1532).²

§ 247. *The Ten Articles. Their Importance.*—It was natural that the German Reformers should watch very eagerly the course of events in England.³ Would the King of England make common cause with them against the Pope and Emperor? And how far was the Church of England prepared to accept the Lutheran views? Partly to answer this latter question, and partly in consequence of a strong complaint by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury as to “errors and abuses” openly being taught in the country,⁴ the Ten Articles of A.D. 1536 were drawn up by the King, and being accepted by the Convocation, were published as a convenient standard of doctrine “to stablyshe Christen Quietnes and Unitie amonge us and to avoyde contentious Opinions.” These Ten Articles (to be carefully distinguished from the *Six Articles* of three years later) are of very great interest and importance, as marking the first effort for *doctrinal* reform in the Church of England, and as models of careful definition. The BIBLE and the three Creeds of Christendom, as interpreted by the Fathers and by the first four General Councils (§ 19), are recognized as the sources of Christian doctrine. Baptism is declared to be a sacrament instituted by Christ as “a thing necessary for the attaining of everlasting life” (S. John iii. 5) is

¹ Belgrade had fallen before the Turkish Sultan, Solyman the Magnificent, in A.D. 1521; and Rhodes (p. 140, n. 2) in the following year. They were, however, repulsed from Vienna with immense loss in A.D. 1529. Compare above, § 188.

² The actual civil conflict broke out after the death of Luther, fourteen years later (p. 233, n. 1).

³ In A.D. 1525 Luther had written to Henry an apology for his scurrilous attack upon him (p. 183 n.) and inveighed against Wolsey. The King published the letter with a severe commentary. See Hallam, “Const. Hist.” vol. i., p. 60 and n.

⁴ The list of them given shows us exactly the confused medley of truth and error that might be expected.

quoted),¹ and conveying to the recipients—due stress being laid on the necessity of repentance and faith in the case of those old enough—“remission of all their sins and the grace of the Holy Ghost, whereby they be newly regenerated and made the very children of God,” and this as a free gift from “God the Father for His Son Jesus Christ’s sake” (Acts ii. 38 and Tit. iii. 5 are quoted).² Penance—consisting of Contrition, Confession³ and Absolution, and Amendment of life—is dwelt upon as a “sacrament” (this name, in the *restricted* sense of the word⁴ we do not now give it—see Art. xxv.), “institute of Christ” for “deadly sin after Baptism” (compare Art. xvi.), the necessity and object of such a CONVERSION⁵ (as we now more usually term the same thing) being set forth in remarkably sober and well-weighed language (S. Luke iii. 8; S. John xx. 23; S. Luke x. 16; Rom. vi. 19; I Cor. ix. 27, xi. 31; Zech. i. 3; and Is. lviii. 7-11, are successively quoted).⁶ In the “sacrament of the altar” a real *and corporal* Presence is affirmed (on this we shall have more to say hereafter); and the solemn words of S. Paul in I Cor. xi. 27-29 are recited, as still in one of the Exhortations of our Communion Service, as an incentive to earnest self-examination. Justification, one of the most fiercely discussed questions of that day, is very carefully treated: while the *free* mercy and grace of God and the merits of Christ’s

¹ Compare p. 327, n. 2.

² See also Acts xxii. 16, and our Baptismal Services throughout.

³ “To a priest, if it may be had; for the absolution given by the priest was institute of Christ to apply the promises of God’s grace and favour to the penitent.” Compare Appendix O, p. 349.

⁴ See Hooker’s paper on the “Nature and Number of Sacraments” (Keble’s ed., vol. ii., pp. 550 ff.), and compare the Homily “Of Common Prayer and Sacraments.”

⁵ Conversion is, of course, essentially distinct from *Regeneration*, with which the Dissenters, to their great mental confusion, identify it. Compare S. Luke, xxii. 32, A. V. and R. V., and see Canon Curteis, “Dissent in its Relation to the Church of England,” p. 390, and below, p. 246, n. 3.

⁶ Compare, on the whole subject, the admirable sermon of the parish priest in Chaucer, “The Persons Tale.”

passion are “the only sufficient and worthy causes thereof,” it is attained by “contrition and faith joined with charity,” a definition contrasting favourably with Luther’s “*Justification by Faith only*,” which, true and precious as it is in itself (see Art. xi. at end of our Prayer-Book), needs careful safeguarding (see Art. xii.), if it is not to open the door—as it did in that day, as a matter of fact, and does still only too often—to mischievous and fearful abuses.¹

§ 248. *The Last Five Articles.*—The last five Articles deal with the “laudable ceremonies” of the Church. Images are allowed, but *image-worship* forbidden;² saints are to be honoured, but not with the honour “only due unto God”; the invocation of saints is commended, but guarded against abuse; the meaning of the Church’s “rites and ceremonies” is explained, and their observance enjoined; and, lastly, prayer “for souls departed” is commended as “good and charitable” and as a primitive usage,³ but the “abuses” advanced “under the name of *purgatory*,” and especially “the Bishop of Rome’s pardons,”⁴ are condemned as unscriptural and wrong (compare Art. xxii.).

§ 249. *Character of the English Reformation.*—Thus careful and judicious were the first steps taken in England for authoritative reform. The Ten Articles already display that spirit of calm and patient appeal to Scripture and the primitive Church, which has marked the English Reformation throughout (§ 228), and has enabled the Church of England to fling off the

¹ Compare 2 Pet. iii. 16, 17; Rom. vi. 15; S. James ii. 22; and the Homily “Of Salvation,” pt. ii. See on the whole question Hooker’s “Discourse of Justification,” §§ 31, 32.

² Thus the Church of England returned to her original position in this matter (above, § 76). S. Thomas Aquinas, on the other hand, commits himself to the amazing assertion that the Cross, and any image of Christ, is to be worshipped with *latraria*, i.e. the peculiar adoration due to God alone! (“Summa Th.,” Pars Tertia, qu. xxv., arts. 3 and 4). Compare p. 59.

³ See Appendix L, p. 335.

⁴ See Appendix H, Indulgences.

Romish corruptions of the Faith on the one hand, while declining the modern inventions of the Protestant sects on the other.

§ 250. *Royal Injunctions*.—The Ten Articles were followed by Royal Injunctions to the clergy, directing them, among other things, to explain at regular intervals to their people the facts about the Royal Supremacy and the abolished usurpation of the Pope (§ 235), and acquaint them with the Ten Articles; also to cause them to learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in English; and to provide in every church a Bible in Latin and *English* for every one to read at pleasure; it was to be discussed, however, and the caution was much needed, “with a sober and modest behaviour.”

§ 251. *Death of Tyndale*.—In October of this year (1536) William Tyndale, the famous translator of the Bible into English and a writer of numerous Reforming pamphlets, who had at Henry's instigation been arrested two years before at Antwerp, suffered martyrdom abroad, near Brussels, being first strangled at the stake and then burned. His last words were, “Lord, open the eyes of the King of England.” So ended one of the simplest and most heroic lives of the Reformation era. (See § 207.)

§ 252. *Demolition of the Smaller Monasteries*.—During the summer of A.D. 1536 the work of taking over the suppressed monasteries and paying off their inmates had been busily carried out by appointed commissioners. The buildings were pulled down, the lead and bells removed, and the sacred vestments and all the furniture and appurtenances of the monasteries sold for what they would fetch. Thus were multitudes of men and women thrust suddenly out of their beautiful and tranquil homes, with but a scanty and uncertain pension, and cast friendless upon the world. Many of them could, indeed, for a time take refuge in the greater monasteries, which were as yet untouched

(§ 244). But these also were shortly to fall a prey to the insatiable greed of Henry and his courtiers.

§ 253. *The Pilgrimage of Grace*.—In the repudiation of Papal supremacy (§ 231), the bulk of the nation had been at one with the King. But it was far otherwise when he passed on to the wholesale confiscation of monastic buildings and endowments. This highly unprincipled act, and the lamentable scenes that accompanied it, kindled all the latent elements of disaffection in the country into one vast flame. First, Lincolnshire rose in arms against the commissioners, and sixty thousand rebels garrisoned Lincoln. This formidable outbreak passed away only to be replaced by a revolt of the whole North of England, known as the “Pilgrimage of Grace,” joined by the Percies and all the great nobles of the North, who bitterly hated Cromwell as a low-born upstart, and as the real director of the King’s ecclesiastical policy. Accordingly, one of the chief things they demanded of the King was the dismissal of his “ill councillors of mean birth.” Priests with crosses marched in front of the insurgent army, to give it the semblance of a religious pilgrimage ; and the banners were inscribed with the Five Wounds of our Saviour, and a Crucifix and Chalice. The movement was only stayed at last by the promise of a general pardon and of a free Parliament at York.

§ 254. *Fate of the Greater Monasteries*.—The vengeance which Henry, or Cromwell in Henry’s name, took at the earliest opportunity for this outbreak was terrible and exemplary. Gibbets covered the country-side ; the highest nobles, and with them no less than twelve Abbots and numerous monks, were hanged indiscriminately as traitors and rebels. And now the King found himself possessed of a terrible weapon against the *greater* monasteries, many of which had, by secret contributions or other natural tokens of sympathy, become compromised by the Pilgrimage of Grace. A searching visitation was begun

(A.D. 1537) of all monasteries as yet untouched ; and no effort was spared to cajole or intimidate them into a voluntary surrender (§ 244) to the King. One after another they gave way ; and three years later the last had disappeared. In some cases of special obstinacy the recalcitrant Abbot was deprived on some pretext, and a more pliable one appointed that he might conduct the surrender¹; and in three cases of special obstinacy—at Reading, Colchester, and Glastonbury—the monastic establishment was, contrary to both law and justice,² held to be *forfeited* by the attainder of the Abbot for high treason, as though the abbey had been the *personal possession* of its Abbot!³ The most ancient and most famous of all was this of Glastonbury (§§ 8, 66); and the brutal execution, A.D. 1539, of its last Abbot, Richard Whyting, an old and venerable man of blameless life and deep learning, on the hill above his beloved monastery, aroused a deep feeling of horror and detestation which all must share. Early in the year 1539 a second Act of Dissolution was passed by Parliament to make legal the seizure of all this monastic property by the King. What became of it all we shall see later on.

§ 255. *The Bishops' Book*.—In the years during which the sad ruin and spoliation of the monasteries was going on (A.D. 1536-40) much else of interest and importance was taking place. In May, A.D. 1537, was published a most important work, the “Institution [*i.e.* Instruction] of a Christian Man,” usually known as “The Bishops’ Book.” It was drawn up, at the suggestion of Cromwell, by a learned committee of all the Bishops, with twenty-five other leading divines, and contained a practical and simple exposition of the Apostles’ Creed (still, says Archdeacon Perry, one of the best we possess), the Seven Sacraments, the Ten

¹ Dixon, “Hist. Ch. Eng.” vol. ii., p. 14 n.

² Hallam, “Const. Hist.” vol. i., p. 72.

³ Dixon, *l.c.*, p. 155.

Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Angelic Salutation, Justification, and Purgatory. The Ten Articles of A.D. 1536 were inserted in it, each under its proper head. The worship of saints and of the Blessed Virgin was tacitly disallowed ; and in the list of sacraments, Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist were distinguished from the four minor ones. This work is another illustration of the sober and deliberate way in which the Church of England was entering upon the great task of doctrinal reform, which she has, on the whole, so carefully and admirably carried out.

§ 256. *Matthew's Bible. Birth of Edward VI.*—In A.D. 1537 also appeared "Matthew's Bible," two years after that of Coverdale (§ 249). It consisted of Tyndale's version, so far as that had been finished at his death (viz., the New Testament, and to the end of 2 Chron. in the Old Testament), the rest being from Coverdale's version slightly revised. Prologues and annotations of a strongly Reforming character were added, and the real editor of Matthew's Bible is believed to have been John Rogers, afterwards the first martyr in Queen Mary's reign.¹ It is one of the greatest marks of Cromwell's influence with the King that he could induce him to permit the publication of this Bible, containing the actual version of Tyndale. But Cromwell was pressing his Royal master too far, and the reaction was soon to come. In this year also occurred the death of Henry's third and deeply-loved Queen, Jane Seymour (§ 245), who passed away twelve days after giving birth to a prince, the future Edward VI., the "darling of the Reformation."

§ 257. *The German Reformers and Henry.*—The German Reformers had not lost hope of obtaining the King of England's adhesion to the Protestant league of defence against the Emperor (§ 246). In May, A.D. 1538, three Lutheran divines came over to confer with

¹ At his trial he was arraigned as "John Rogers, alias Matthew." See § 302.

the Archbishop of Canterbury and a small committee of English Bishops and divines. A basis of doctrinal agreement, in thirteen Articles, was reached, which was of considerable service when the Forty-Two Articles were drawn up in the next reign (§ 291); but the negotiations finally came to nothing, as the Germans insisted on condemning the practices of communion in one kind (§ 278), private masses, and celibacy of the clergy, which were all upheld by Henry.

§ 258. *Papal Bull of Deposition*.—Not only was the dissolution of the greater monasteries going busily on during this year, but also in the Cathedrals and parish churches all over the land the shrines were being plundered and destroyed, and the bones of the saints within them scattered to the winds. In August the gorgeous shrine of S. Thomas of Canterbury, so long the object of popular veneration and superstition (§ 130), was rifled of all its accumulated mass of treasures, after a mock-trial¹ of the saint, and his condemnation as having been in his lifetime a traitor, whose goods were therefore fitly forfeit to the Crown! The two festivals of S. Thomas, December 29th and July 7th, were now expunged from the kalendar. We are not surprised to hear that the Pope at this time drew up, in its final form, against the Royal robber his long-threatened Bull of excommunication and deposition, couched in the most terrific terms. If it was ever actually *published*, which is, to say the least, extremely doubtful,² it is certain that it was entirely disregarded both abroad and at home; and the result only served to show the impotence of the Pope in English affairs.

¹ Canon Dixon's attempt to discredit this story ("Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. ii., p. 71 n.) is perhaps hardly successful. On the vast wealth of the shrine, the richest in the world, see pp. 64, 70, of the same standard work.

² Canon Dixon, *op. cit.*, p. 97 n. It is unknown to contemporaries like Hall, unknown to Foxe, unknown even to Fuller. Saunders, who summarises it in A.D. 1588, says its execution was suspended, and never speaks of its being actually fulminated. Contrast above, §§ 134, 154, and below, § 328.

§ 259. *Cromwell's Injunctions.*—In September Cromwell, as Vicar-General, issued fresh Injunctions in the King's name, ordering, among other things, that a large Bible should be placed in every church, half the cost to be borne by the parson, and half by the parishioners, who were to be exhorted to read it, but “*to avoid all contentious altercation therein, and to use an honest sobriety in the inquisition of the true sense of the same, and refer the explication of obscure places to men of higher judgment in Scripture.*” Sermons were to be preached regularly against superstitious practices; and all images that had been “abused with pilgrimages or offerings or having any candles set before them” were to be taken down.¹ One of these Injunctions ordered, for the first time, the keeping of *parish registers* (of christenings, weddings, and burials), which henceforth were to take, however imperfectly, the place of the voluminous chronicles of the monasteries.²

§ 260. *Henry and the Reformation.*—These Injunctions of A.D. 1538 mark the extreme point to which the Reformation advanced in this reign. Already Cromwell's influence was waning with the King, who (to his credit be it said) was greatly shocked by the “jangling” in discussing the Holy Scriptures that went on “in every alehouse,” and the profane ribaldry and mockery in which many who had adopted extreme Reforming views unhappily indulged in their recoil from the superstitions of the past. In April, A.D. 1539, a new Parliament was summoned, that it might, among other things, check sharply the rapid growth of heresies.

§ 261. *The Six Articles.*—Now, accordingly, the Act of the “Six Articles,” though its introduction was strenuously opposed by Archbishop Cranmer and

¹ The famous Rood at the north door of S. Paul's Cathedral (p. 156, n. 1) was therefore now removed by the Dean, on the eve of S. Bartholomew.

² Canon Dixon, “Hist. Ch. Eng.” vol. ii., p. 83.

other Bishops of the Reforming side,¹ was passed after long and keen discussion in the House of Lords and a consultation with the Canterbury Convocation, to stop the religious controversies with which the country was seething, and to establish, at least outwardly, a uniform belief. The Six Articles thus enforced were Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, clerical celibacy, vows of chastity as binding for life, private masses, and the necessity of auricular confession. The penalty for denying Transubstantiation was loss of goods and death by *burning* (compare § 177); and by a peculiar aggravation, the offence being against a statute law, escape by abjuration was no longer possible to the accused, as had always been the case hitherto. The penalty for denying any of the other five Articles was imprisonment and loss of goods, to be followed, on a second offence, by execution as a felon! The very strictness of this dreadful statute, known as the "Whip with Six Strings," caused it to be mainly used as a deterrent; yet as many as fifteen persons are known to have suffered death under it in London. Archbishop Cranmer, in spite of his late opposition to the King's will, remained unharmed (§ 268). Latimer, the most prominent, after him, of the Reformatory party, resigned his see, and was placed for a time in the nominal custody of the Bishop of Chichester. The Act was to some extent moderated in A.D. 1544, and was repealed altogether at the beginning of the next reign.²

§ 262. *Bishop Latimer.*—The famous Hugh Latimer, whom we have just mentioned, was a Cambridge scholar of humble birth, who had succeeded to the position which Dean Colet had formerly held (§ 197),

¹ Latimer, Shaxton, Goodrich, Barlowe, and Heath.

² Another famous Act of this time gave to the King's *proclamations* (but only under very careful limitations and restrictions) the force of law. See Hallam, "Const. Hist." vol. i., p. 35; Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. ii., p. 130.

of being the foremost preacher of the day and a zealous advocate of Church reform. His homely and trenchant quaintness of style had made him a great favourite with Henry (§ 240), who appointed him a Royal chaplain in A.D. 1530, and Bishop of Worcester in A.D. 1536. He will come before us again in the course of the next two reigns.

§ 263. *The Great Bible, or Cranmer's Bible.*—In April, A.D. 1539, was published the "Great Bible," "truly translated," as the title-page declares, "*after the verite of the Hebrue and Greke textes by ye dylygent studye of dyverse excellent learned men expert in the forsayde tonges.*" It was a revision of Matthew's Bible of two years before (another revision of which, Richard Taverner's Bible, with a very strong Reformatory preface, had been privately published this year); and it had been prepared, by the procurement of Cromwell and the express sanction of the King, under Coverdale's supervision at Paris. It is also known as "Cranmer's Bible," because the Archbishop, after another careful revision,¹ re-issued it the following year (A.D. 1540) with a special prologue or preface written by himself. Dr. Bonner, afterwards so notorious as a persecutor in the reign of Mary, had, as English ambassador at Paris, taken great interest in its preparation; and on becoming Bishop of London this same year (A.D. 1539), he actually placed six copies of it in S. Paul's Cathedral. So entirely were Reformers and anti-Reformers at one in their desire at this time to put the pure Word of God in English before the people.

§ 264. *Its Use in the Prayer-Book.*—The "Great Bible" had an enormous sale, and remained the authorized version of the Church till the Bishops' Bible of Elizabeth's reign (§ 326). From it comes the *Prayer-Book Version* of the Psalms, so familiar and so dear to English Churchmen, which has been retained con-

¹ "In some parts the translation is entirely recast, and the renderings totally different."—BAGSTER'S *English Hexapla*, p. 29.

tinuously in the services of the Church on account of its musical renderings, and the exquisite felicity of its diction. The Ten Commandments and the Offertory Sentences in the Prayer-Book are also taken from this "Great Bible."

§ 265. *Fall of Cromwell.*—In A.D. 1540 came at last the fall of Thomas Cromwell, who, ever since that of Wolsey, had been all potent in the councils of the King. Like Anne Boleyn, Cromwell had entirely identified himself with the progress of Reform ; and he had incessantly laboured in every way to advance it, not without seriously straining his influence with the King. He had been endeavouring to bring about an alliance between Catholic France and the Protestants of Germany by the mediation of England, in order to beat back the Emperor Charles V., and thus to save the struggling Reformation cause in Germany. With this end in view he induced Henry to wed a plain-featured German princess, Anne of Cleves, the daughter of the Lutheran Duke of that place. But the skilfully-planned coalition came to nothing ; Henry found himself chained to a wife whom he detested, without any compensating political benefit ; and the ever-watchful enemies of Cromwell took advantage of the King's bitter mood to obtain his arrest for treason (June 10th). At once the long-pent-up hatred against him burst forth (§ 238). Again, as in the case of Anne Boleyn, Cranmer braved the Royal displeasure and interceded, though in vain, for his friend, when all others forsook him. The recent marriage was annulled by Convocation and by Parliament, on the flimsy pretext of a pre-contract. Anne was honourably pensioned off in England ;¹ and the Royal widower (§ 256) married Katharine Howard, niece of Cromwell's rival and foe, the Duke of Norfolk, on the very day that Cromwell himself was hurried to the block (July 28th).

¹ She lived till A.D. 1557, and was buried in Westminster Abbey.

§ 266. *Period of Reaction.*—The sudden fall of Cromwell struck panic into the ranks of the extreme Reformers. It deprived them of their one powerful protector and patron : there was no one now to stand between them and the terrible Six Articles' Law ; and the successors to Cromwell's power were strong opponents of the Reforming movement, such as the Duke of Norfolk and Bishop Gardiner of Winchester. The Privy Council stepped into the place of Cromwell, and continued the system of terrorizing despotism which he had perfected,¹ instantly and effectively repressing the slightest manifestation of public feeling in any part of the country. Two days only after Cromwell's execution, one of the saddest sights of the reign was seen. Three Lutheran divines, who had been condemned, without a trial or hearing of any kind, by a bill of attainder in Parliament, were burned at Smithfield as heretics, for their Lutheran views on *Justification* ; and at the same place and time three adherents of the Pope and opponents of the divorce—priests who had been connected with Queen Katharine, and had long been lying in prison—were hanged, drawn, and quartered as traitors, for denying the *Royal Supremacy* (§ 236). They were dragged to the place of execution on three hurdles, a Lutheran and a Papist bound side by side on each. Thus impartial in his injustice was the terrible King ! Four others of the Reforming party suffered under the Six Articles' Act in May and June ; and again seven adherents of the Papacy under the Supremacy law in August. Among the latter was the foreman of the jury that had tried Anne Boleyn.²

§ 267. *Henry's Fifth and Sixth Queens.*—Katharine Howard, Henry's fifth Queen, whose influence, while it lasted, was adverse to the Reformation, soon found

¹ Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. ii., pp. 258-261.

² Giles Heron, a son-in-law of Sir Thomas More. In the following year, A.D. 1541, the venerable Countess of Salisbury, mother of Cardinal Pole (p. 211, n. 2), was brought to the block.

that the steps of the throne were slippery with blood. Having aroused her fierce husband's jealousy, she was attainted and beheaded in A.D. 1542. Her successor, Katharine Parr, in secret a strong supporter of the Reforming doctrines, had the good fortune to outlive her lord. But one of the ladies of her Court, Anne Ascough (Ascue), a personal friend of the Queen, was in A.D. 1546 seized and tortured, and then, as Fuller says, "glorified the Lord in the fires" (Is. xxiv. 15); and the Queen herself had on one occasion a very narrow escape.¹ Executions were, in fact, numerous during these closing years of a suspicious tyrant soured by disappointment and painful disease. Henry's sun, now near its setting, was slowly going down in a sea of crimson horror.

§ 268. *The King and the Archbishop.*—Cranmer's position after the fall of Cromwell was one of more than ordinary peril; and many were the efforts made by those adverse to the cause of Reform to destroy his influence with the King. But although the Archbishop remained firm in his adhesion to the Reformation cause, nothing availed to shake the Royal friendship and confidence. In A.D. 1543 Convocation appointed at his instance a committee to "examine, correct, and reform" the ancient service-books: the ultimate outcome of their labours, the Book of Common Prayer, will come before us early in the next reign.

§ 269. *The King's Book.*—An important publication of this year (1543) was the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christen Man," usually called the "King's Book," to distinguish it from the "Bishops' Book" (§ 255), of which it was a thorough revision by Cranmer and a committee of Bishops and divines appointed in A.D. 1540, before Cromwell's fall, and working under the personal supervision of the King.²

¹ After Henry's death she married Sir Thomas Seymour, a brother of his third wife (§ 245), and died in A.D. 1548.

² Compare § 195, end.

It is notable as insisting on Transubstantiation, and asserting in stronger terms than the other book the King's ecclesiastical Supremacy.

§ 270. *Bible-reading restricted.*—The copies of the Great Bible which Bonner had placed in S. Paul's Cathedral (§ 263) did not remain there long : in consequence of the heated discussions and controversies that went on around them, the Bishop soon declared himself obliged to remove them. And in A.D. 1543 Bible-reading was absolutely forbidden by Act of Parliament to all artificers, apprentices, serving men, husbandmen, yeomen, labourers, and all women under the rank of gentlewomen. Tyndale's version and all others with Reforming annotations were entirely prohibited.

§ 271. *The English Litany.*—In A.D. 1544 the English Litany, which was afterwards incorporated in the Prayer-Book (§ 282) and remains one of the most beautiful of the services of our Church, was authorized for public worship. It was drawn up out of the old Church litanies by Archbishop Cranmer at the Royal command, and is written in that wonderfully melodious English of which Cranmer was a master. This, with the reading of two chapters from the English Bible, as lessons, after the Te Deum and the Magnificat respectively (ordered by Convocation in A.D. 1543), was the whole amount of service in *English* actually authorized in this reign, though more was in contemplation.

§ 272. *The King's Primer.*—The last publication of Henry's reign was the "King's Primer" (A.D. 1545), a manual of private devotions designed to supersede the unauthorized Reforming primers, of which several had been published¹ and were widely in use. It was really compiled and translated by Cranmer ; and the new English Litany (see above) was inserted in it. It also contained the Apostles' Creed, Lord's Prayer, Ten

¹ Jaye's "Prymer," A.D. 1529 ; Marshall's, A.D. 1534-5 (§ 240, end); Hilsey's, A.D. 1539.

Commandments, the Angelic Salutation, prayers for Mattins Evensong and Compline, the Dirige, and some "godly" private prayers. Similar books of devotion in English, under the name of "Prymers," had already for centuries been in use in the Church of England, and they can be traced back even to Saxon times.¹

§ 273. Death of Henry VIII. Summary of the Reign.—King Henry VIII. died in A.D. 1547. Very much had been effected in his important reign. The Royal jurisdiction had been reasserted, and the Papal jurisdiction, never legally constituted in England, had been altogether abolished; the monasteries—the strongholds of Papal power—had been swept away; the Bible had been translated into English for all to read; a revision of the old service-books had been taken in hand. But there had been no attempt, nor the faintest desire, to break down the ancient National Church, and set up a new "Protestant" one on its ruins! Such an idea is too ludicrous to those who know anything of the character of Henry, who was himself to the day of his death a bigoted adherent of Romanism in everything, except so far as concerned the usurped power of the Pope (§ 239, end). The destruction of the monasteries did not touch the Church; her own buildings, her Cathedrals and parish churches remained as before, served by the same Bishops and clergy, performing the selfsame sacred duties and services as from time immemorial. The old Church of England did not cease to be the Church of England, when she threw off, as by one convulsive effort, the corrupt and alien jurisdiction which Rome had imposed gradually upon her.

§ 274. Fate of the Monastic Property.—And now

¹ Procter, Book of Common Prayer, pp. 14, 15. In A.D. 1545 the long-expected Council of Trent had its first meeting (see below, § 322). Two months later Luther died (A.D. 1546), and the long-restrained passions of Germany broke loose in the Schmalkaldic War of A.D. 1546-7.

what became of all the monastic property thus confiscated by Parliament and the King?

(i.) Abbeys and priories founded since the Norman Conquest were entirely demolished, because foreign,¹ never having been possessions of the English Church, but founded under Papal authority and exempted from the jurisdiction of the English Bishops. Their picturesque ruins still dot the country-side: they were not given to, or taken into use by, the National Church at all, except in some cases where, as for instance at Malmesbury, the abbey church was on the site of a former parish church; the nave was then left standing for the parishioners still to worship in, the chancel, the *monastic* part of the edifice, being pulled down. The same distinction between monastic and church property was carried out at the Universities, where the *monastic* colleges only were destroyed.²

(ii.) The case of the pre-Norman abbeys was different. They had been founded by or for the National Church herself, before the rise of the Papal power in England. Eight of these abbey churches, being already Cathedrals, remained untouched—Canterbury, Rochester, Norwich, Winchester, Worcester, Ely (§ 112), Durham, and Carlisle—all that was required being to replace the “regular,” *i.e.* monastic clergy, who had hitherto served them, by a Dean and chapter of “secular” clergy, *i.e.* clergy not under monastic discipline (see § 84), like the rest of the English Cathedrals, which, not being served by monks, were not interfered with at all. The last Abbot or Prior of the monastery was generally made the first Dean of the new foundation: and as numerous other members of the monastery remained in various capacities on the Cathedral staff, the change to the new condition of

¹ Lane, “Illustrated Notes on Eng. Ch. Hist.” vol ii., pp. 44, 50, 59.

² Canon Dixon, “Hist. Ch. Eng.” vol. ii., p. 208.

things was often very slight. Five other pre-Norman abbeys were now advanced to Cathedral rank, and made the seat of new Bishoprics, according to Wolsey's great scheme (§ 206), viz., at Oxford, Gloucester, Bristol, Peterborough, and Chester;¹ a sixth, at Westminster, being suppressed and changed into a collegiate church, ten years later, in Edward VI.'s reign.² It may be noted that as early as A.D. 1532 the King had planned the erection of *six* new Bishoprics out of abbeys, and had obtained a Bull from Rome for the purpose. A few monasteries were reconstituted as non-monastic collegiate churches, as at Windsor and eventually (see above) at Westminster. Some were bought up or otherwise acquired by the parishioners, and became parish churches, as at Tewkesbury. Henry VIII. founded out of the monastic spoils a great college at each of the Universities, Christ Church, Oxford (Wolsey's "Cardinal College"), and Trinity College, Cambridge, as well as some professorships at each University. Some of the free grammar schools which the monasteries had maintained all over the country (§ 204) were spared to continue their work of education, as at Canterbury and Worcester. And the hospitals of S. Bartholomew and S. Thomas in London were allowed to continue their work of charity, only no longer as *monasteries* (compare § 293 below).

(iii.) But with these meagre exceptions, the feeble wreck of Wolsey's far-sighted plans, all the enormous spoils obtained by the dissolution of the monasteries went into the coffers of the King and his nobles and dependants. The abbey lands were sold or granted away wholesale to Royal favourites.³ And even such of the parochial *tithes* as had become monastic shared the same fate. A practice had grown up, especially after

¹ This ancient see (§ 103) was thus again revived.

² Thirlby, the first and only Bishop, was translated to Norwich in A.D. 1550, and the see of Westminster was dissolved.

³ See Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." ii. 209, ff. ; Lane, "Illustrated Notes on Ch. Hist." p. 53.

the Conquest, by which patrons might grant away the tithes of their parishes to some monastery, on condition that it maintained a deputy or *vicar* to look after the spiritual wants of the parish.¹ All such tithes, instead of being now restored (as in fairness they should have been) to the parishes from which they had been alienated, were granted away just like the other property of the monasteries, and remain many of them to this day payable, by a curious anomaly, to "Lay Rectors," who provide a vicar to perform the spiritual duties. Whenever there is a "Vicar" of a parish instead of a "Rector," it is generally a sign that the original tithes have been thus alienated from the parish. And another thing must be noticed. In the next reigns Bishops and chapters were forced by law to *purchase* many of these parochial tithes by giving in exchange for them Church lands and revenues, which were then either retained by the Crown or granted away to laymen, in whose hands they still remain.² Tithes thus acquired are doubly the Church's own, bought under compulsion from rapacious Sovereigns, when in justice her own already. The most absurd falsehood that the State *endowed* the Church at the Reformation has been refuted over and over again. The converse is true; the State *robbed* the Church as much as it could and dared, and thus crippled her energies for centuries. Melancholy proofs of this will come before us in the next reign.

¹ See Appendix D, p. 321.

² Hallam, "Const. Hist." vol. i., p. 77. The Act 1 Eliz. cap. 19 empowered the Queen during the vacancy of any see to take episcopal lands in exchange for any inappropriate tithes within it belonging to the Crown (§ 334 below).

CHAPTER XIV

REIGN OF EDWARD VI. PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION

“The Church of England before the Reformation, and the Church of England after the Reformation, are as much the same Church, as a garden, before it be weeded and after it is weeded, is the same garden ; or a vine, before it be pruned and after it is pruned and freed from the luxuriant branches, is one and the same vine.”—ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL.

“To rectify a crooked stick we bend it on the contrary side, as far as it was at the first on that side from whence we draw it, and so it cometh in the end to a middle between both, which is perfect straightness.”—CARTWRIGHT, quoted by Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.* iv. 3. § 2.

§ 275. Accession of Edward VI. The Duke of Somerset.—To Henry VIII. succeeded in A.D. 1547 his only son, Edward VI., who was not quite ten years old. He was the child of Henry’s much loved third wife, Jane Seymour (§ 256); and her brother, Lord Hertford, afterwards Duke of Somerset, soon made himself head of the Council of Regency nominated in Henry’s will, and obtained supreme power with the title of “Lord Protector.” His views were strongly in favour of the Reformation movement, which had been very roughly checked in Henry’s later years (§ 260), but was now free to go rapidly forward. In this reign, accordingly, the Church found herself for a short time under a domination of extreme Protestantism, just as in the next reign, Queen Mary’s, she found herself under an equally brief domination of extreme Romanism, learning from each bitter but salutary lessons, till finally under Elizabeth she reached the position she

had been feeling after so long and has ever since retained, CATHOLIC yet REFORMED, clamoured at by the sects of Dissent because Catholic, clamoured at by the sect of Romanists because Reformed, yet ever the centre of all that is best and steadiest in the national life.

§ 276. Royal Injunctions. The Book of Homilies.—On the accession of Edward VI., then, the Protestant party within the Church came gradually into power.¹ Royal visitors were sent throughout England with Injunctions to the clergy, mainly repeating those of Henry VIII. No lights were to be permitted before any image or picture, “but only two lights upon the High Altar, before the Sacrament, which for the signification that Christ is the very true light of the World,² they shall suffer to remain still.” Each Church was to provide itself with a “Bible of the largest volume in English,” and also a copy of the English translation of the valuable Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the Gospels. Among other things, the order about parish registers (§ 259) which had been little attended to,³ was renewed. Owing to the “lack of Preachers in many places,” one of the “Homilies” was to be read every Sunday. The Book of Homilies thus imposed on the Church, in a way characteristic of this reign, by Royal authority alone without the sanction of either Convocation or Parliament, consisted of sermons drawn up under Cranmer’s supervision at the end of the late reign, and designed to remedy in some measure the fearful dearth, at this time, of good preachers.⁴ They

¹ It must be remembered that the extremists on neither side (neither the Protestant-inclined nor the Roman-inclined) were anything more as yet than parties *within* the Church. They did not dream of taking the schismatical step (§ 1) of seceding from the unity of the National Church. See further, Appendix K, p. 334.

² S. John viii. 12. It is strange that any should object to this beautiful and expressive symbolism, now so widely restored in our churches under the Ornaments Rubric in the Prayer-Book (§ 309).

³ For the reason see Canon Dixon, “Hist. Ch. Eng.” vol. ii., p. 498 n. Compare below, § 344.

⁴ On the ruinous state of both the Universities in consequence of the

deal with the subjects of Bible-reading, Human Misery, Salvation,¹ Faith, Good Works (these three by Cranmer himself), Charity or Christian Love (by Bishop Bonner), Swearing, the Danger of Falling from God, the Fear of Death, Obedience to Rulers, Adultery, and the “detestable vice” of Contention, especially in religious matters. It was directed they were to be read “*every Sunday in the year at high mass, when the people be most gathered together, . . . except any sermon be preached.*” Though now practically obsolete, they are still recognized in a rubric of our Communion Service, and in Article xxxv., together with the Second Book of Homilies, published afterwards in Queen Elizabeth’s reign (below, § 320). The latter redeemed a promise which still appears at the end of this first Book to provide further Homilies “of Fasting, Prayer, Almose-deeds: of the Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Saviour Christ: of the due Receiving of his blessed Body and Blood, under the form of Bread and Wine:² against Idleness, against Gluttony and Drunkenness, against Covetousness, against Envy, Ire, and Malice; with many other matters, as well fruitful as necessary to the edifying of Christian people and the increase of Godly living.” Such were the efforts made by Cranmer and others, and especially by the earnest-hearted Ridley, to meet the sore necessities of the time, and restore to its due place the unspeakably important ministry of preaching.³

wholesale plundering of monastic and other endowments, see Canon Dixon, *op. cit.*, vol. iii., pp. 98-99, 285, 291, 384-385, 534.

¹ To the theology of this Homily Bishop Gardiner took strong exception, and Cranmer explained to him his meaning. Canon Dixon, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 448.

² This passage seems to have escaped the notice of Canon Dixon, when he animadverts on the non-inclusion of this subject in the Book of Homilies, as though no more were in contemplation and preparation. The intention was of course only frustrated by the brevity of the reign.

³ ² Tim. iv. 1, 2. This text was chosen by Bishop Ridley as the motto for his Visitation Articles in A.D. 1550. Compare § 88 above.

§ 277. *Protests against the Council.*—Bishop Gardiner and Bishop Bonner, as representatives of the other school of thought, and as prominent ecclesiastical advisers of the late King, protested strongly against the way in which the Council was taking upon itself to wield the powers of the Royal Supremacy in the nonage of the King. Both Bishops were sent to prison; and after liberation they were again committed, and finally suffered deprivation, Bonner in the year 1549, Gardiner in 1551. The Princess Mary (afterwards Queen) also strongly remonstrated; and neither her rank nor her relationship with the German Emperor (§ 213) saved her from repeated petty molestation.¹

§ 278. *Communion in both kinds restored.*—In December of Edward's first year (1547) Communion in both kinds was restored to the English Church by the action of Convocation, followed by that of Parliament. Thus the body of the faithful recovered a right still strangely denied to all Romanist laity, who are never permitted to obey our Lord's command and drink of the Cup of His Blood (§ 184). Of all the Roman innovations this mutilation of the Sacrament (see p. 163, n. 4) is one of the most daring, setting aside, as it deliberately does, a positive ordinance of our Lord, the practice of His Apostles and of the primitive Church, and the unbroken usage of the whole of Christendom for at least eleven hundred years. The recovery of this privilege for every baptized and confirmed member of the community is not the least of the many blessings the Reformation has brought us.

§ 279. *New Arrangements.*—Much of the tyranny built up by Henry VIII. fell at once with him. Thus the novel definitions of treason and felony which had disgraced the late reign, and under which such men as Fisher and More had suffered, were repealed. The appointment to Bishoprics was now vested solely in

¹ Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. iii., pp. 145-147, 240-242, 298-317.

the Crown (compare § 65), without the formality and safeguard of the elections, by *congés d'écrire*, in the Cathedral chapters (§ 161). The latter system was properly restored after Edward's death, and has continued uninterruptedly ever since.¹

§ 280. *Dissolution of Chantries and Guilds.*—Henry VIII. had despoiled the monasteries; it remained for his successors to despoil the Church: and this they proceeded to do most thoroughly. Already Henry's last Parliament had granted him the power of seizing upon all chantries, hospitals, free chapels, and guilds (A.D. 1545), and the work of confiscation had only been stayed by his death. In spite of the opposition of Cranmer and other Bishops, a still more comprehensive measure was hurried through Parliament by the new rulers; and as many as 90 colleges, 110 hospitals, and 2,374 chantries and free chapels are said to have been confiscated; among them the great Royal chapel, *S. Stephen's*, in the palace of Westminster, so well known from its occupation henceforth by the House of Commons, which had hitherto sat in the Chapter-house of Westminster Abbey. The guilds, which were now so ruthlessly swept away for the sake of their property, were religious associations of men and women in the Middle Ages, "partly for mutual assistance in temporal matters," like our clubs and friendly societies, and for works of charity (for the poor were never forgotten in mediæval times), and partly also for "mutual prayers for their welfare while living, and for their soul's

¹ Those who are inclined to minimize or ridicule the formal *election* of our Bishops by their chapters, after they have been already selected by the Crown (see p. 203), should ponder the words of a recent historian speaking of the state of *Parliament* under Henry VIII.: "The part which the Houses were to play in after years shows the importance of clinging to the forms of constitutional freedom, even when their life is all but lost. In the inevitable reaction against tyranny, they furnish centres for the reviving energies of the people, while the returning tide of liberty is enabled through their preservation to flow quietly and naturally along its traditional channels."—J. R. GREEN, *Short History*, p. 350.

health when dead. These guilds usually maintained a chaplain" (often more than one), "whose duty it was to celebrate mass daily for the brethren and sisters of the guild." The *chantry* revenues were endowments left in former times to pay priests to "chant" daily masses for the founder's soul at his tomb, under the pathetic but mischievous delusion as to purgatory (see Art. xxii.) which had been so sedulously fostered in the mediæval Church (below, p. 336, n. 4). "The chantry priest had sometimes a chantry-house to live in, and estates for his maintenance; sometimes he had only an annual income charged on the estate of the founder." Many of the old chantry chapels are still visible in our Cathedrals and parish churches: they are "sometimes built on to the church and opening into it, sometimes merely a corner of the church screened off" by wood-work. Chantry and guild priests were expected to help in the parochial services on Sundays and holy days. "Sometimes the chantry chapel was built in a hamlet at a distance from the parish church, and was intended to serve as a chapel of ease."¹ These endowments had become exceedingly numerous, and the amount of booty seized by the Government was enormous. *All of it was swept into the coffers of the State:* and the greater part of it was miserably squandered.

§ 281. *Wholesale Church Spoliation*.—It might be endured that these revenues, which undoubtedly ministered to superstition, should be permanently lost to the Church, by however unjust a confiscation. But spoliation did not stop there. Church revenues and lands, Church plate, vestments, altar linen, and valuables of every description, even to the very brasses on Church floors and the lead on Church roofs—nothing came amiss to the Lord Protector and his friends, who, in plain English, exploited the Reformation movement for their own selfish ends and to satisfy their own personal greed. Westminster Abbey itself, the "storied

¹ Cutts, "Middle Ages," p. 205.

abbey loved of Englishmen," had a very narrow escape from demolition : Somerset had made up his mind to pull down the grand old minster, and was only turned from his purpose by the surrender to him of half its landed property by the Dean ! S. Margaret's Church, Westminster, was the next object of his attack : it too was fortunately saved from his workmen, but only by a riot of the parishioners. Finally, Somerset pulled down a parish church and three episcopal residences in the Strand, and on the site thus obtained built his palace —still known as "Somerset House"—with materials gotten by the demolition of yet another church, and also of a cloister of S. Paul's Cathedral ! And now went forth from the government those ruthless orders to destroy "from wall and window every picture, every image, commemorative of saint or prophet," which were obeyed by fanatics all over the country, and the terrible results of which are yet visible far and wide in our old churches and Cathedrals.

§ 282. *The Book of Common Prayer*.—It is a relief to turn from the sound of the axes and hammers breaking down the carved work of the sanctuary (Ps. lxxiv. 6), to an event which makes the year 1549 for ever memorable in the history of the English Church. The committee appointed by Convocation in the late reign to revise and remodel the ancient service-books (§ 268) had been reconstituted in January, A.D. 1548, so as to consist of six Bishops and six other divines, viz., the Bishops of Ely, Rochester, Lincoln, Westminster, Hereford, and Chichester ; the Deans of Lincoln, Exeter, and S. Paul's ; the Archdeacons of Ely and Leicester ; and the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge¹—with Archbishop Cranmer as president. In March they issued a form for the Communion of the people in

¹ Of these the Bishops of Rochester (Ridley) and Lincoln, the three Deans, and the Archdeacon of Ely, belonged to the Reformed school of thought. The Bishop of Chichester (Day) alone refused to sign the book when completed.

English,¹ as a temporary appendix to the Latin service ; and they completed their responsible labours in November. The English Prayer-Book thus drawn up was submitted to Convocation,² to Parliament, and to the King, and ratified by the Act of Uniformity in January, A.D. 1549, just before the close of the *second year* of King Edward. Hence the wording of the well-known “Ornaments Rubric” in our present Prayer-Book. It was not till *three years later* that the use of the Church’s ancient ecclesiastical vestments became, through the increasing pressure of fanaticism, for a few months illegal (see below, §§ 290, 309).

§ 283. *The Prayer-Book a revision of the old Service-Books. Its Comprehensiveness.*—The English Prayer-Book of A.D. 1549 was no new composition. It was a very careful revision and simplification of the old service-books of the Church of England (§ 103), translated out of the original Latin into most beautiful and musical English.³ The principles which guided the committee of revision will be found in their Preface, which is still printed in our Prayer-Books under the heading “Concerning the Service of the Church”; and also in the section “Of Ceremonies,” which was then printed at the end.⁴ It has since been four times revised : in A.D. 1552, during this same reign (§ 290) ; in A.D. 1559, after the accession of Queen Elizabeth (§ 309) ; slightly in A.D. 1604, under James I. ;⁵ and finally, and

¹ It contained the Exhortation, Confession and Absolution, Comfortable Words, and Blessing, which found place in the completed Prayer-Book, and are still in use.

² This is somewhat dubious : but it is expressly asserted by the King to the Devonshire rebels, and to Bonner ; and by the Council to the Lady Mary. The evidence against it (Canon Dixon, “Hist. Ch. Eng.” vol. iii., pp. 5 n., 127 n., 130, n. 2, 146, n. 3, 147, n. 3, 161, n. 3 ; vol. iv., p. 73 n.) is merely negative, and therefore not conclusive.

³ The Latin names of the Canticles, as *Te Deum*, *Magnificat*, etc., and of all the Psalms (taken in each case from the opening words) remind us of the time when all the Prayer-Book was in Latin.

⁴ The first part of our present Preface was written at the last revision.

⁵ The last part of the Catechism was added, drawn up by Bishop

very carefully, in A.D. 1662, after the Restoration. Even in its final shape it has been surprisingly little altered, as a glance at a reprint of this first edition of A.D. 1549 (which can be purchased for 9d.) will show. In its present form, the Book of Common Prayer gives us, blended in their due proportions, and modelled throughout on the ancient services, of which it is mainly a condensation and translation,¹ all the constituent elements of public worship—the preparative cleansing by solemn Confession and Absolution; the “opening of the lips” in thanksgiving and praise;² the listening to God’s holy Word; the prayers for our necessities both temporal and spiritual.³ This is the common groundwork both of the daily Mattins and Evensong, and of the Holy Communion, the latter having, of course, in addition, as its central object, the solemn offering of the Memorial Sacrifice before God,⁴ with earnest pleading of the precious Death on behalf of the “whole Church,” and the drawing near to “eat the Flesh and drink the Blood” of the Victim “slain from the foundation of the world.”⁵ The other offices hallow with their consecrating touch every crisis and every turning-point in our earthly life. In Holy Baptism the little ones are brought and admitted by a new birth (“regeneration”) into the Covenant of Grace, cleansed from the deep taint of original sin (§ 17), united to Christ in the way of His own appointment,⁶

Overall, at this time: and also the prayer for the Royal Family, and the Occasional Thanksgivings.

¹ See Archdeacon Freeman, “Princ. of Div. Serv.” *passim*.

² We *thank* God for what He has done for *us*: we *praise* Him for what He is in *Himself*. The Psalms, which we sing through regularly every month, are full of both.

³ The rationale of our worship is carefully explained to the congregation in the well-known opening exhortation, “Dearly beloved brethren . . .”

⁴ On the sense in which the Holy Communion may be termed, as by the early Christians, a *sacrifice*, see Appendix M.

⁵ S. John, vi. 51-63; S. Matt. xxvi. 26-29; Rev. xiii. 8.

⁶ See above, § 3, and for Infant Baptism (Art. xxvii., end) see p. 4, n. 6. See also below, p. 246, n. 3.

and made partakers of the wondrous Divine life which they must either develop or forfeit¹ hereafter ; public and regular Catechizing—for which no “Sunday School” can be an efficient *substitute*, however valuable an auxiliary—is carefully provided to teach them the way which they must go;² Confirmation brings to them for the battle of life the strengthening gift of the Holy Spirit (p. 4, n. 8), as well as a precious opportunity of publicly and individually confessing their Lord (S. Matt. x. 32 ; Rom. x. 9, 10) ; every service they attend calls them to be continually *converted*, i.e. turned back to God, from sin.³ Holy Matrimony hallows their entrance into that “honourable estate” ;⁴ in the Churching of Women, the happy mother returns her public thanks ; the Visitation of the Sick comforts and consoles the sufferer ; the Communion of the Sick lights up the pain-filled or the dying bed with unearthly radiance ; and finally, the Burial Service lays the faithful to their rest “in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection.”⁵ The Prayer-Book, as the late Professor Brewer has well said, is, “as

¹ S. John, xv. 2, 6 ; Heb. vi. 4;9, R.V. ; 2 Cor. vi. 1 ; Rom. xi. 21-22 ; 1 Tim. i. 19.

² Two common mistakes as to the Catechism may be noted here : (1) the child is taught to do its duty in “that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me” (not “has pleased,” as usually and most unfairly misquoted) ; (2) “all my betters,” in another famous phrase, denotes, of course, “all those who are morally better” than myself, and is as fitting in the lips of the highest as of the lowest in the land.

³ The opening words of the Prayer-Book, “When the wicked man turneth away,” are the keynote of the whole. It has been well observed that the three marks which the Church of England specially aims at forming in her children are reserve, thoroughness, and a continuous, but not unhopeful, *penitence*. The misuse of language by which Dissenters identify Regeneration and Conversion (p. 219, n. 5) is a source of much mental confusion even to many of our own people. Conversion is rightly defined in the Homilies as the “turning again of the whole man unto God, from whom we go away by sin.” See S. Luke, xv. 11-20, xxii. 32.

⁴ See the first Exhortation in the Marriage Service, which contains important teaching, too often slurred over.

⁵ Not “of his Resurrection.” It is important to notice that the Burial Service is so worded as to express no judgment, whether favourable or unfavourable, of the *individual* (Rom. xiv. 4).

a book of Social Prayer, the most wonderful achievement of any age—the greatest, next the Bible, of any human production.” The *English Bible* and the *English Prayer-Book* are two great trophies of the Reformation, for which we may well thank God. They have been of priceless benefit to the whole English-speaking race, and through it to the world.¹

§ 284. *Obligation of Auricular Confession and of Clerical Celibacy removed.*—The Prayer-Book thus first published in A.D. 1549, among other things, definitely abrogated the system of universal *compulsory* Confession which had been first imposed on the Church by Pope Innocent III. at the Lateran Council of A.D. 1215 (§ 133). Each one was henceforth left at liberty, as in primitive days, either to resort to the comfort and help of particular and private Confession, or to be content with the *General Confession* and *General Absolution* of the public services.² At this time also was removed from the clergy the yoke of *compulsory* celibacy imposed of old by Hildebrand (above, § 97): it was abrogated, in the proper constitutional manner, first by Convocation (without a dissentient voice), and then by Parliament.³ These were two very important gains to the cause of Christian liberty (1 Cor. ix. 1, 5; 1 Pet. ii. 16), which it was one great aim of the Reformation, within due limits, to promote.

§ 285. *The Devonshire and Norfolk Rebellions. Fall of Somerset.*—The terrible misgovernment of the time, and the prevalent discontent, which was partly agrarian and connected with the forced inclosures going on everywhere, partly religious and connected with the attempt to extirpate, by new Royal Injunctions, all the old picturesque and beautiful Church ceremonies, endeared to the people by a thousand associations,⁴ brought about

¹ Bishop Barry, “Teacher’s Pr.-Bk.” Introd. On some misrenderings in the Prayer-Book Version of the Athanasian Creed, see Appendix N.

² See Appendix O, Confession in the Church of England.

³ Compare Art. xxxii. at end of the Prayer-Book.

⁴ Many of these had no doubt become tainted with superstition, but

widespread insurrections in this year, especially in the West of England, where ten thousand men rose in arms against the new service-book, and in Norfolk, where the disturbance was due solely to the *social* grievances, the rebels there being in full sympathy with the Reformation. Both rebellions were roughly trampled out by means of foreign mercenaries : but the troubles shook the power of the Duke of Somerset (§ 275), and led eventually to his fall, the unscrupulous Earl of Warwick, afterwards Duke of Northumberland, taking his place at the head of the Council of Regency.

§ 286. *Foreign Fanatics in England. The Anabaptists.*—As the short reign of Edward VI. went on, England became more and more a place of refuge for foreign Protestants, flying from persecution abroad. Amongst these were many of extreme and violent views, who poured over the land a flood of strange heretical speculations, denying, some one, and some another, of the fundamental verities of the Christian Faith, to the grief and bewilderment of the Bishops,¹ as well as practising that reiteration of Baptism which gave them their name *Anabaptists*:² their socialistic and revolutionary tenets made them withal a standing menace to civil order and government.³ For denying the Incarnation of our Lord, one of these poor fanatics, a woman named Joan Bocher, was, sad to say, burned at Smithfield in A.D. 1550, after a year's imprisonment, under a warrant signed by the Council ; Cranmer and Latimer had both

their attempted abolition by a high-handed decree of the Council was to the last degree unwise and impolitic (compare above, p. 59).

¹ See the remarkable letter of Bishop Hooper about them ; and Dr. Gibson, "Thirty-Nine Art." vol. i., pp. 22-25, 91, 120, 145, etc. They revived ancient heresies, casting every article of the Faith anew into the crucible of unlicensed speculation, and especially attacked the Incarnation and the Divinity of our Lord.

² In this denial of Infant Baptism (see p. 4, n. 6) their modern followers, the "Baptists," are still faithful to their tenets. [The "Baptists" are a modern sect which broke away from the Independents (§ 330) in A.D. 1633.]

³ Compare Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." Preface, ch. viii. §§ 8-12. Henry VIII. sent fourteen Anabaptists to the stake in A.D. 1535.

sat on the commission which tried her.¹ Another of Arian views, George von Parris, also suffered a similar death the following year. It is strange to find the execution of these *two* foreigners (a sad enough blot upon the reign) seized upon by Romanists to justify or palliate the wholesale burnings of men and women in the next reign, that of Queen Mary.²

§ 287. *Peter Martyr, Bucer, and John A'Lasco.*—Cranmer himself invited over to England some of the most eminent of the foreign Reformers, two of whom, Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer, were appointed to the Regius Professorships of Divinity at Oxford and Cambridge respectively, while a third, a Polish nobleman named John A'Lasco, was made superintendent of the numerous refugee communities (consisting of French, Italians, and Germans) in London. The two chief remaining events of this reign, the revision of the Prayer-Book and the drawing up of the Forty-Two Articles, were largely due to their presence and influence.

§ 288. *Peril to Church Principles in this reign. Hooper and Ridley.*—The years 1550-3 were years of great peril to the Catholic position of the English Church, the ultra-Protestant group which now swayed the Royal counsels showing their dislike and hatred not only to mediæval errors and corruptions,³ but to the ancient and Catholic usages which it is the wisdom of the Church of England to have purged of error and retained in use (§ 275). The actions of two excellent but misguided men, in particular, Hooper and Ridley, sowed seeds of discord, the bitter harvest of which was only to be fully reaped in the disorders of the following century, though personally they atoned

¹ The well-known story of Cranmer's overcoming the reluctance of the young King to sign the death-warrant is one of the fables of history. The King's signature was neither asked for nor required.

² See § 302. Two Anabaptists were burned for heresy in A.D. 1575 in Elizabeth's reign, and another at Norwich in A.D. 1584; and two Arians in the reign of James I., A.D. 1611.

³ See Appendix F, p. 324.

grandly for the harm they unwittingly did to the Church by the splendid constancy of their deaths, four years later, in the fiery persecution of Mary's reign. *Hooper*, who had left the country on the passing of the Six Articles' law in the late reign (§ 261), and had imbibed in Switzerland the extreme opinions of the Reformers there under Calvin's leadership,¹ refused, on being nominated to the Bishopric of Gloucester in A.D. 1550, to wear at his consecration the proper and legal episcopal vestments, which he termed, in language as vigorous as it was untrue, the livery of the "harlot of Babylon." In this course of action, though supported by John A'Lasco and his foreign congregations, he was opposed by Ridley and all the more moderate Reformers, including Bucer and Peter Martyr. At length he was committed by the Council, for seditious language, to the Fleet Prison ; and, after a fortnight's imprisonment, gave in his submission, admitted the harmlessness of the vestments "in themselves," and was consecrated in full canonicals (March, A.D. 1551). *Ridley*, the learned Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, had become Bishop of Rochester early in this reign, and was now intruded into Bonner's see of London, Bonner having just been deprived and imprisoned by the Royal Council (§ 277). Ridley, who argued against the scruples of Hooper as to the vestments, yet himself proceeded to an act fruitful of sacrilege and profanation, when he ordered the ancient stone altars of our churches, hallowed to Englishmen by the Christian rites of centuries, to be swept away throughout his diocese, and replaced by wooden tables, which might be set up anywhere and anyhow in the churches. And his example was followed by a general order from the Council (A.D. 1550). The step was no doubt well-meant ; and we must bear

¹ The unique sway of Calvin at Geneva lasted from A.D. 1541 till his death in A.D. 1564. His burning of the Unitarian rationalist, Servetus, a Spanish physician, took place in the year 1553.

in mind the immense difficulties in the way of weaning men's minds from the errors and abuses which had gradually grown up as accretions upon the Mystery of the Holy Sacrifice,¹ and especially the vulgar error with which many minds were then possessed, that the Holy Communion was a real actual offering up of Christ afresh as a propitiatory sacrifice,² and not merely a commemoration and pleading of the one Sacrifice once for all offered on Calvary. Nor again must it be forgotten that a wooden table, so far from being essentially wrong for the "altar" or "table of the Lord,"³ was the more primitive and suitable form.⁴ Yet it is difficult to speak at all calmly of this daring step, taken without any sanction or consultation of Convocation or Parliament, for it was a deliberate attempt to break one of the strongest links of the long and hallowed past of our Church, dim with the mist of centuries, on which English Churchmen love to dwell. The mischief and irreverence which in fact resulted from this "act of sacrilege—for we can call it nothing else—"⁵ were very great indeed. The Bishop of Chichester, for venturing to oppose the order, was sent to prison by the Council, and eventually deprived. Of liberty at this time there was none. The pulpits were gagged ; and the nation held down by hired bands of foreign soldiers, who, in the preceding year, had shot down by thousands the men of Devonshire and Norfolk, when atrocious mis-government had goaded them into insurrection (§ 285).

¹ See Appendices E, G, and M.

² See Art. xxxi. To this strange heretical doctrine of *reiteration*, as then vulgarly held and taught, there are numerous allusions in Cranmer's treatise on the Eucharist. See (in Todd's edition) pp. 2, 41, 105-106, 157, 229, 237, 238, 241-242, 245, 249. Compare below, p. 338, n. 1.

³ For this *twofold* name for the *same thing*, compare especially Mal. i. 7, 11, 12; Ezek. xli. 22; 1 Cor. x. 16-22; S. Matt. v. 23, 24; Heb. xiii. 10 (for the only adequate explanation of this latter passage, see Freeman, "Princ. of Div. Serv." vol. ii., p. 13 and note). See also below, p. 338 notes.

⁴ It is supposed that stone altars arose out of the use of altar-tombs, as in the Catacombs.

⁵ Dean Spence, "Ch. of Eng." vol. ii., pp. 225, 293.

Such were some of the fruits of “the worst cabal that ever governed England.”

§ 289. *Cranmer on the Eucharist.*—In this year Cranmer published a treatise on the Holy Communion, in which he laid stress on the necessity of devout and faithful *reception*, as distinguished from the mere *hearing of the service*, which had to a large extent practically taken its place.¹ In a polemic work against Romish errors at so critical a time, it would be vain to expect a calm and adequate survey of the whole question,² and in some points Cranmer decidedly laid himself open to adverse criticism.³ While expressly rejecting the efforts of Zwingli and other Swiss Reformers to explain away the Mystery altogether (p. 217, n. 2), he now⁴ took refuge, in his recoil from Transubstantiation, in a fresh theory, started by Calvin, which looked upon the Holy Elements not as channels of grace divinely ordained for the conveyance of supernatural strength, but as merely signs and tokens of a process of *faith* going on separately in the believer’s soul. Practically, indeed, this theory may be termed defective rather than essentially erroneous,⁵ and in the hands of its highest and most thoughtful exponents it differs but slightly from that of the “Real Presence.” But it entirely fails to satisfy the very strong expressions of the Bible and the primitive Church, and it inevitably opens the door, sooner or later, to Zwinglianism. Yet

¹ Hence the phrase so often heard at that time, “turning the Mass into a Communion.” “The English Church, at the time of her Revision, had received from the Middle Ages a melancholy inheritance of inveterate unfrequency of communion upon the part of the people.”—ARCHDEACON FREEMAN, *Princ. of Div. Serv.*, vol. ii., p. 444.

² Such as may be found in the late Archdeacon Freeman’s work, just cited.

³ Bishop Gardiner’s reply was written in the Tower, and published in France. To Cranmer’s answer Gardiner published, under a feigned name, another rejoinder. Further controversy between them was cut short by Cranmer’s imprisonment and death.

⁴ Cranmer’s vacillations on this mysterious subject were very great.

⁵ See the very important remarks of Archdeacon Freeman, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., Introd., pp. 196-209. Compare Canon Bright, “Waymarks,” p. 198 n.

Cranmer's treatise, whatever its defects, was an important and valuable one. "God grant," says he, in noble words which we may heartily echo, "that, all contention set aside, both the parties may come to this Holy Communion with such a lively faith in Christ, and such an unfeigned love to all Christ's members, that as they carnally eat with their mouth this sacramental bread and drink the wine, so spiritually they may eat and drink the very flesh and blood of Christ, which is in heaven and sitteth on the right hand of His Father."¹ The work naturally attracted much attention: it was translated into Latin for foreign readers in A.D. 1553 by the young King's tutor, Sir John Cheke; and, after a review by Cranmer himself in prison, was republished in A.D. 1557.

§ 290. *Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.*—The Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.'s reign was issued in A.D. 1552. It was a revision of the First Prayer-Book (§ 282) in a strongly Protestant direction, due to the pressure of the foreign Reformers and of the young King himself. Owing to the death of Edward the following year, and the accession of Mary, it never came into general use. Much that was beautiful and ancient and might well have been retained was struck out in it, and the Communion Service in particular suffered serious loss. The temporary mischief then done has been to a considerable extent repaired in the successive revisions of the Prayer-Book since; but there are many who, like the saintly Bishop Wilson,² would gladly see the First Prayer-Book restored to at least optional use in the Church of England, as the closest existing reproduction of the ancient service-books of the National Church. It is noticeable that the Act which legalized the Second Prayer-Book speaks of the

¹ In words such as these, which Churchpeople of all shades of thought can accept, the Church of England recovered her former position, as indicated in the pre-Norman authorized Homilies of Aelfric (§ 88). The work of Ratramn (ninth century) had been recently republished abroad in A.D. 1532 and 1541, and in an English translation by Ridley himself in the year 1548. See Appendix G.

² Canon Daniel, "Prayer Book," p. 35.

First in terms of the highest praise as "a very godly order . . . agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church."

§ 291. *The Forty-Two Articles.*—In the last year of the reign the Forty-Two Articles, which had been carefully drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley, in consultation with leading divines, on the basis of the (unpublished) Thirteen Articles of A.D. 1538 (§ 257), were ratified by the King and Council, and set forth in the name of the clergy, but without being submitted to Convocation.¹ They were intended to define the doctrinal position of the Church of England against Rome on the one hand, and the Anabaptists (§ 286) on the other,² just as the Church of Rome was then engaged in defining her doctrinal position by the Council of Trent, of which we shall have to speak presently (§ 322). Under Elizabeth they were again subjected to a careful and searching revision, and reduced to Thirty-Nine,³ which, being accepted by Convocation, have ever since remained a doctrinal standard for the English clergy, and will be found printed at the end of the Prayer-Book.

§ 292. *Church Spoliation.*—The sad and shameful spoliation of the Church, which forms such a blot upon the whole Reformation period, went on as unblushingly under the Duke of Northumberland (§ 285) as under Somerset before him (§ 281), in spite of the earnest efforts of the great Reforming preacher, "honest" Latimer (§ 262), to stem by his fearless and outspoken denunciations the irresistible advance of cupidity. The sees were continually being impoverished and robbed of their best possessions: for instance, the see of Lincoln was mercilessly pillaged; that of Gloucester lost all its estates, and was united (till Mary's reign) to Worcester;

¹ This is certain, in spite of a purposely ambiguous declaration on the title-page. See Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. iii., pp. 513-517.

² See Dr. Gibson, "Thirty-Nine Art." pp. 22-25.

³ By the total omission of six of the Forty-Two Articles, the addition of four (the present Articles v., xii., xxix. and xxx.), and the blending of two into one (the present Art. vii.). Numerous minor alterations of

and Durham, the magnificent Bishopric of the north, after the flagrantly unjust imprisonment and deprivation (by a commission of *laymen*),¹ of its aged diocesan, the mild and gentle Bishop Tonstall, was dissolved and then refounded with the loss of the greater part of its endowments, a mischief which had to be repaired by a special Act of Parliament in Mary's reign. From Westminster Abbey were conveyed away "the splendid ornaments of countless Royal pomps, coronations, funerals, and other solemnities,"² and so at S. Paul's Cathedral. Throughout the country churches were swept bare, by commissioners, of everything beyond the most absolute necessities of public worship. Plate, ornaments, vestments, bells, etc., down to even the very coins in the poor-boxes, were taken, all without a shadow of legality, on the plea of the King's necessities! Much was, indeed, concealed for happier days; but much *private robbery* of sacred things was likewise going on in all directions. The Acts of Parliament confiscating the monasteries (§§ 244, 254) had opened wide the flood-gates of wickedness and sacrilege, and none now availed to shut them. Poor Church of England—robbed and despoiled by her own sons, as many would love to rob and despoil her again now, under the specious pretext of *Disestablishment*!

§ 293. *Action of Edward VI. Foundation of Schools and Hospitals.*—The young King, always grave and thoughtful beyond his years, was now growing up and becoming sensible of the miseries of this most miserable time; and to his honour he made what efforts he could in the way of reparation. From the proceeds of the sale of chantry lands and free chapels (§ 280) he founded and endowed in different parts of the country twenty-two grammar schools, to replace some of the

importance were also made. It is too often forgotten in interpreting the Articles that they were purposely made as wide and inclusive as possible. See further, § 319.

¹ October, A.D. 1552. Cranmer would have nothing to do with the foul proceedings against this Bishop.

² Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. iii., p. 451.

numerous monastic schools which, with all their deficiencies, had formed an educational network all over the kingdom (§ 204). These grammar schools are still called after their young founder's name.¹ On the site of the Grey Friars' monastery (§ 140) bequeathed to London by Henry VIII., he founded "Christ's Hospital" for orphan and indigent children, better known as the "Bluecoat School," blue being in Edward's time a colour worn by servants and apprentices. S. Thomas's and S. Bartholomew's he re-endowed as hospitals for the sick poor (§ 274, ii.); and the Royal palace of Bridewell he gave up and transformed into a house of correction for the undeserving and the vagabond.

§ 294. *Death of Edward VI. Accession of Mary.*—The youthful monarch—he was not yet sixteen—died in July, A.D. 1553; and ultra-Protestantism, which had thoroughly sickened men with the greed, fanaticism, and misgovernment it had displayed, fell with him. The whole country was seething with discontent, and the young King—one of the saddest and most pathetic figures in our history—was undoubtedly "felix opportunitate mortis."² The desperate effort made at the last moment by him and his advisers to place Lady Jane Grey (a beautiful and accomplished girl of sixteen),³ as a favourer of Reforming views, upon the throne, failed utterly. In the strong reaction of men's minds a general burst of joy hailed the accession of the true heiress, Henry VIII.'s eldest daughter, MARY. Little did men suspect what her reign had in store for England, and that four short years would see no less than two hundred and forty men and forty-six women suffer death by fire for their religion.

¹ E.g. King Edward's School, Birmingham, famous in our day for its three great alumni, Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Westcott, and Archbishop Benson.

² The climax of misgovernment had been reached in this his last year, when the *whole country* had to be placed under martial law!

³ She was the eldest grandchild of Henry VIII.'s *younger* sister, Mary (compare below, p. 288, n. 2).

CHAPTER XV

REIGN OF QUEEN MARY. THE REFORMATION CHECKED

"Tek thou my word vor't, Joan,—and I bean't wrong not twice i' ten year—the burnin' o' the owld archbishop [Cranmer] 'ill burn the Pwoap out o' this 'ere land vor iver and iver."

TENNYSON, *Queen Mary*, act iv., sc. 3.

"The reign of Mary was necessary to show to England the solid value of the Reformation, which had been obscured by the horrible extravagances of tyranny, greed, and cruelty that had hitherto attended it."—CANON DIXON, *Hist. Ch. Eng.*, vol. iv., p. 176.

§ 295. *Accession of Mary. Cranmer and others arrested.*—Mary, daughter of the Spanish Princess Katharine, Henry VIII.'s injured Queen (§ 211), was now thirty-seven years old. She came to the throne, not only with all the religious bigotry and subserviency to Rome which then characterized her nation,¹ but also with a deep hatred of everything connected with the Reformation, as the outcome of her mother's troubles. The five Bishops² who had been unjustly sent to prison and deprived by the Council in the late reign were at once reinstated in their sees; and one of them, Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester (§ 239), became Lord Chancellor, and Mary's chief adviser. The foreign refugees were ordered to quit the country, and hastened to obey; and many others, discerning the coming storm, fled likewise, and took refuge in Frankfurt, Geneva, and other Continental towns.³ Cranmer

¹ See below, p. 260, n. 2.

² Those of Winchester, Durham, London, Worcester, and Chichester.

³ See below, p. 269, n. 3.

refused to fly : in consequence of rumours that with the altered times he had altered his views, he drew up a strong declaration and challenge concerning the restoration of the Latin Mass, intending to set it solemnly on the doors of S. Paul's Cathedral and all the London churches. The paper was prematurely published without his consent ; and he was arrested by order of the Council, and sent to the Tower. Bishops Latimer and Ridley were also arrested for seditious preaching : and soon afterwards the Archbishop of York for "divers his offences."

§ 296. *Repeal of the Edwardine Legislation.*—The Queen's own strong wish was to undo at one blow all the Reformation proceedings since A.D. 1529. But her first Parliament could not be induced to cancel the legislative work of Henry's reign and bring back the Papal dominion. The ecclesiastical legislation of Edward VI. was repealed, after a long and violent debate of eight days : and thus the condition of things at the end of Henry VIII.'s reign was restored. Hence, for more than a year after the Queen's accession, she was herself constrained to use in all State documents the obnoxious title, "on earth Supreme Head of the Church of England," which her father had caused to be added to the titles of the English Crown, to exclude all pretence of Papal power in England above the Throne (§ 234).

§ 297. *Convocation. Position of Cranmer.*—Convocation was now called upon to assent to the dogma of Transubstantiation. Most of the prominent Reformers had fled across sea ; but a small minority of members was found to offer a determined, though ineffectual, resistance. Archbishop Cranmer, brought to trial with others for treason in the matter of Lady Jane Grey (§ 294), pleaded guilty, and threw himself upon the Queen's mercy : he was reserved in custody to await the more fearful charge of *heresy*.

§ 298. *Royal Injunctions. Deprivation of Bishops*

and Clergy.—Stringent Injunctions were now issued (A.D. 1554), ordering, among other things, the deprivation of all married clergy (see § 284), and the forcible divorce from their wives of such of them as had ever taken monastic vows. Over two thousand Christian homes were thus ruthlessly broken up.¹ The Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Bristol, Chester, and S. David's were deprived for matrimony : and the Bishops of Lincoln, Gloucester, and Hereford on the plea that their consecration was null, and that the letters patent by which they had been appointed in the late reign were revocable by the Crown.² The places of all the Bishops thus summarily deprived were filled by fresh elections under Royal *congés d'érire*, i.e. licences to elect (see §§ 161, 279).

§ 299. *The Queen and the Pope.*—Thus the proceedings of Edward VI.'s reign had been roughly but effectually undone, and, had matters stopped there, all might yet have been well. But this was very far indeed from contenting the Queen, who was determined to restore in all its fulness the Papal domination in England. The great obstacle in the way was the alienation of the abbey lands, which could not now be wrested back from their lay owners, while yet the Pope was extremely unwilling to sanction the wholesale confiscations of Henry VIII. He had appointed the Queen's cousin, Cardinal Pole (§ 239), legate to England as soon as he heard of Mary's accession : but the Cardinal was not permitted by the Government to set foot in England till this very knotty point should be satisfactorily dealt with.

§ 300. *The Spanish Marriage. Its Importance.*—And

¹ Even the Romanist historian Lingard estimates the number at about fifteen hundred, and this is almost certainly too low. Compare Hallam, "Const. Hist." vol. i., p. 104 n.

² "Ob nullitatem consecrationis ejus et defectum tituli sui quem habuit a Rege Edw. VI. per literas patentes cum hac clausula, Dum bene se gesserit." These are in each case the two reasons assigned. Compare above, § 241.

now took place (July, A.D. 1554) the Queen's marriage to Philip of Spain, her cousin, who thirty-four years later was to send against us the Spanish Armada (§ 340 below). This fatal marriage changed altogether the character of the reign, which *up to this point* had been comparatively mild. The Spanish bigotry of Philip was well known ; and the very proposal of the marriage had led to a desperate Protestant rising in the spring under Sir Thomas Wyatt, a youth of twenty-three, which all but cost the Queen her crown.¹ Outwardly, indeed, the union was a very brilliant one ; for Philip, besides possessing Spain and the vast Spanish possessions in America (§ 192), was the son of the great monarch, Charles V. of Germany (§ 213), who, in fact, abdicated in his favour the following year, making him to all appearance the mightiest potentate on the earth. But this marriage was understood to mean for England the introduction of the hateful methods of the Spanish Inquisition, already infamous for its cold-blooded and ruthless extirpation of "heresy."² It was with great difficulty that Mary wrung from her second Parliament its reluctant consent to the union on which she had set her heart. The nation felt instinctively the approach of danger ; and, as a matter of fact, it is only to the sagacity and firmness at this crisis of Bishop Gardiner, and the stringent stipulations under which he bound the coming King, that England owes her escape from passing, at the death of Mary, under the permanent yoke of Spain.

§ 301. *Landing of Cardinal Pole. Absolution of the*

¹ One result of this abortive rising was the execution of Lady Jane Grey (§ 294), whose innocence and constancy to the Reformed faith made a deep impression upon the public mind.

² The Inquisition (p. 158, n. 1) had been restored in Spain on a fresh basis by Pope Sixtus IV. in A.D. 1479, under Ferdinand and Isabella, and had been placed on a permanent footing by Torquemada four years later, so as to be in the closest connection with the State. Its power there lasted for more than three centuries ; and it was not finally abolished till the year 1820.

Nation.—Parliament, with the Queen's chief adviser Bishop Gardiner, steadily refused to allow the landing of Cardinal Pole till the Pope had guaranteed the retention of the alienated ecclesiastical property by its lay holders. The Pope was extremely unwilling to do so : but at length, after long delays, he signed a Bull giving to Pole full powers of settlement.¹ Therefore in November, A.D. 1554, four months after the Royal nuptials, Pole's attainder for treason in Henry's reign² was reversed by Mary's third Parliament, and he was able to land without danger in England—he had been proscribed and in exile for twenty years. His arrival was followed by a solemn absolution of Parliament and the whole nation, and a formal reconciliation with Rome. Statutes were now passed reviving, alas, at the Queen's own instance, the old penal laws against the Lollards (compare § 229), and also repealing all the legislation against the Papacy since A.D. 1529. It is very noticeable, however, that the Royal Supremacy was in fact, though not in name, saved by a clause safeguarding “any authority or prerogative belonging to the Crown before” this year 1529, and that the Statutes of Provisors and *Præmunire*, the ancient bulwarks against Rome (§ 174), remained unrepealed. How Mary herself—strange to say—had recourse to the powers thus left her against the Pope, we shall see hereafter.

§ 302. *The Marian Persecution.*—The brutality of the fiery persecution which now ensued (A.D. 1555-8), and which lights up with a ruddy glare the pages of

¹ The extreme reluctance of Rome in this matter is illustrated by the action of a new Pope, Paul IV., the following year. He issued a Bull commanding full restitution of all ecclesiastical and monastic lands and possessions *everywhere*. He was very quickly forced, however, to explain away this, so far as England was concerned, in a second Bull. (Canon Dixon, “Hist. Ch. Eng.” vol. iv., pp. 385-386 and note.)

² Pole had followed up his ferocious attack on Henry VIII. in the year 1535 (§ 239) by his no less bitter “Apology to Cæsar,” A.D. 1539. His mother, the aged Countess of Salisbury, was executed in A.D. 1541 (p. 230, n. 2).

our English histories, was only equalled by its folly. It rooted in the breasts of Englishmen that deep horror and detestation of "Popery" which has never since died away.¹ The first to suffer was John Rogers, Vicar of S. Sepulchre's in London and Prebendary of S. Paul's Cathedral, who had edited "Matthew's Bible" in Henry VIII.'s reign (§ 256). After eighteen months' imprisonment in Newgate, he was brought out and burned at Smithfield (February 4th, A.D. 1555) amidst intense popular excitement. Four days later, another London vicar, Lawrence Saunders, was burned at Coventry: and then Dr. Rowland Taylor, a beloved Suffolk clergyman, suffered the same agonizing death in his own parish of Hadleigh; and Bishop Hooper, under circumstances of the most shocking cruelty, in his own Cathedral city, Gloucester. In the following month another Bishop, Ferrar of S. David's, was sent to the stake at Caermarthen, a town in his diocese. Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, early recoiled and retired from the horrible work, in which Bishop Bonner of London gained unenviable distinction, no less than one hundred and twenty-eight suffering in his diocese. The victims of the persecution were of all ages, and all ranks and classes; fathers, mothers, and children; Bishops and clergy; gentlefolk and tradesfolk; labourers and illiterate; and even young girls. Sometimes men and women were burned in batches, ten or eleven or more together, as at Stratford-le-Bow in June, A.D. 1556 (eleven men and two women), and at Lewes in June, 1557 (six men and five women); sometimes they suffered singly, or with one or two

¹ The great see of Rome was in older days intensely loved and revered by Englishmen (compare pp. 35, n. 1, 49, 75). But the long series of wrongs and oppressions inflicted upon us for centuries (see §§ 135, 139, 142-3, 155, 157, 161-3, 169, 174-5, 186, 190), culminating in the frightful horrors of Mary's reign, and the sickening suspense in which the nation lived for years afterwards (below, §§ 329, 337, 340) sufficed to turn that love into the deepest abhorrence. Compare the second heading to Chapter II.

companions ; but always with great crowds of awe-struck and sympathizing spectators.¹ In six dioceses (Durham, Lincoln, Carlisle, Worcester, Hereford, and Bath and Wells) the Bishops, to their honour, shrank altogether from the work of blood, and no burnings took place.

§ 303. Martyrdom of Bishops Latimer and Ridley.—On October 16th of this year (1555) two well-known English Bishops, Latimer, the favourite preacher of Henry VIII. (§ 262), now eighty years old, and the earnest and zealous Bishop Ridley, worn out both of them by long imprisonment, were led forth to die by fire. “*Be of good comfort, Master Ridley,*” cried the aged Latimer, “*and play the man. We shall this day light such a candle by God’s grace in England as I trust shall never be put out,*”—brave, bright words of hope, which have been a legacy and an inspiration to the Church of England ever since.² On the same spot where they suffered at Oxford (marked now by the Martyrs’ Memorial there) Cranmer himself six months later was brought out to the same death by fire. The long delay in his case was due to his rank as Metropolitan, which necessitated application to the Pope himself for sentence. Against that sentence, when it arrived, Cranmer, like Archbishop Chicheley before him (§ 186), solemnly appealed from the Pope to a future free General Council.

§ 304. Martyrdom of Archbishop Cranmer. Effect of his Death.—The sad story of Cranmer’s fall is well known : how he was tempted by the offered bait of life and pardon to sign three successive recantations ;³

¹ “Every death at the stake won hundreds to the cause of its victims.”—J. R. GREEN, *Short History*, p. 366.

² Ridley’s sufferings were fearfully protracted, the faggots having been heaped up too tightly around him by the mistaken kindness of a brother-in-law. “His body stood upright some time after life was extinct ; then fell, it was observed, into the ashes that remained of Latimer.”—CANON DIXON.

³ The number is generally said to be six : but the first three of these

and how at last his gentle and timorous nature gathered strength from its very weakness in the great scene at S. Mary's, Oxford, when to the hushed and astonished audience he repudiated his recantations as wrung from him by unworthy fear of the flames, and vowed that the hand which had signed them should be the first to suffer.¹ That shuddering dread of the stake to which Cranmer confessed sent a responsive thrill through the nation; and all hearts were touched by the infinite pathos of his end. In spite of much moral weakness, we owe to Cranmer an immense debt for our noble English Liturgy, in the translation and arrangement of which he had so large a share, and directly or indirectly for nearly all that is best in the Reformation results. "His death completed the circle of five men of episcopal degree, who loosed the yoke of Rome from the neck of the Church of England by the sacrifice of their lives: a glorious crown of bishops, the like of which is set upon the brow of no other Church in Christendom."²

§ 305. *Archbishop Pole. Quarrel of Mary with the Pope. Death of the Queen.*—The burning of the great English Metropolitan, the Primate of All England, at the bidding of the Bishop of Rome³ (Saturday, March 21st, 1556), is a fact that can never be forgotten by the English people: it will live in story to the end of time. The day after Cranmer's martyrdom Cardinal

were not recantations, but short forms of submission to the Papal authority as being now legalized in England. Compare below, n. 3.

¹ When the fire was applied, the Archbishop "stretched forth his right hand, thrust it into the flame, saying with a loud voice 'This hand hath offended,' and held it there, so that all men could see it sensibly burning before the flame reached any other part of his body. He only once withdrew it from the blaze, that he might wipe his forehead. In a while the pile was fully kindled: the flames rushed upon his body, but he in perfect silence looked the agony down, as it were, standing without stirring in the greatness of the fire, till life departed. He died with extraordinary fortitude."—CANON DIXON, *Hist. Ch. Eng.*, vol. iv., p. 545.

² Canon Dixon, *l.c.*, p. 552.

³ Cranmer took his stand throughout on the Royal Supremacy, and refused to recognize the Papal Court, as being a foreign one.

Pole, whose character was, like his predecessor's, a somewhat weak and timid one, was consecrated to Canterbury as his successor. Pole was, as we have already noted, himself of Royal blood and related to the Queen, with whom he was a great favourite. Like Wolsey, he had twice¹ been very near obtaining the Papacy, to which no Englishman but one (§ 120) has ever been elected. But he was under suspicion at Rome as too much a favourer of the Lutheran views on Justification; and the new Pope, Paul IV.,² was also on political grounds his bitter enemy. In A.D. 1557 he suddenly revoked Pole's legatine commission and summoned him to Rome, meeting the remonstrances from England by raising to the Cardinalate an aged and obscure English friar at Greenwich, named Peto, and appointing him legate to England in Pole's stead. Mary's Tudor blood was roused, and she showed herself for once the true daughter of our English Kings. She forbade the Papal nuncio to land, ordered the ports to be guarded, refused to allow Pole to leave the kingdom, and wrote very sharply to the Pope on his behalf. This quarrel with Rome helped to embitter Mary's last days. She had failed hopelessly in everything—failed to win her cold-hearted husband's love³—failed in her foreign policy, for Calais, the last and cherished possession of England on French soil (§ 187), had fallen—failed above all in her religious plans, for the whole nation was now in silent revolt against them. She died, November 17th, A.D. 1558, and Cardinal Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury, died only a few hours later. About the same time passed away no less than nine others of the English Bishops.⁴

¹ In the years 1550 and 1555. On the first occasion he missed the Papacy by two votes only. See Canon Dixon, *op. cit.*, vol. iii., p. 172, and vol. iv., p. 379.

² See below, p. 270, n. 1.

³ Philip quitted England in A.D. 1555, and "save for a flying visit in 1557, Philip and Mary met no more on earth."—DEAN SPENCE.

⁴ Canon Dixon, *op. cit.*, vol. iv., p. 726 and note.

§ 306. *The last Victims. Review of the Persecution.*—A week before the Queen's death, three men and two women were burned together at Canterbury, who, "according to their own unselfish prayer" at the stake, proved to be the last of the martyrs. During these four terrible years two hundred and forty men and forty-six women had died by fire for refusing the Romanist tenets, and at the very least a hundred others, as it seems, had died miserably in the prisons before reaching the stake.

CHAPTER XVI

REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH. THE REFORMATION SETTLEMENT

Παντὶ μέσῳ¹ τὸ κράτος Θεὸς ὥπασεν.

ÆSCHYLUS, *Eumenides*, 529.

“The English was a true *Reformation*. Some may think it defective and others excessive ; but it was not secession, it was not destruction, it was not revolution—it was reform. It took a long time to effect. Its work went through many reigns, beginning with Henry VIII. and certainly not perfected till Charles II. It retained all fundamental doctrines, it respected all ancient formularies, it changed no ancient constitution. It had the same creed, the same clergy, even the same service—translated and purged, but not abolished—the same Church courts, the same Church laws. There was but one thing which it absolutely swept away, viz., the usurped supremacy of the Pope and its natural consequences.”—BISHOP HAROLD BROWNE, A.D. 1875.

§ 307. *Accession of Queen Elizabeth. John Knox in Scotland.*—The new Queen, Elizabeth, daughter of Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn (§ 225), was, fortunately for the peace of the Church, in sympathy with neither of the extreme parties which had, each in its turn, been in power during the two preceding reigns. Like the bulk of the nation, she simply wished to preserve as far as possible the state of things at Henry’s death : and it is largely to her wisdom and far-seeing guidance that we owe the final settlement of the long Reformation struggle, and the careful preservation in England of all Catholic essentials. How different the result *might* have been we see from what took place in the neighbouring kingdom of Scotland, at that time

¹ See § 275, end.

entirely independent of English rule (§ 158). Led by the fiery oratory of John Knox, who had been one of Edward VI.'s chaplains and itinerant preachers, and was now returning¹ from exile at Geneva deeply imbued with the teachings of Calvin there, the Scotch began not merely to lay their most ancient monasteries in ruins (as had happened in England under Henry VIII.), not merely to smash to atoms ornaments, statuary, and stained glass in the churches (as had too often been done in England under Edward VI.), but to destroy altogether the ancient Church of Scotland, the Church of S. Columba, to which Englishmen owe so deep a debt of gratitude (§ 36). The rule of the Scottish Bishops, with the whole system of the Church's machinery, was swept away ; and in its stead was eventually set up throughout the country the new-fangled *Presbyterian* system, recently invented by Calvin at Geneva² to take the place of Episcopacy, which had hitherto, from the earliest times (§§ 6, 7 above), been universally accepted as the only mode of government in the Church of Christ. Like us, the Scotch wished to get rid of the Papal power and of mediæval abuses : but, unlike us, they made a clean sweep of all, good and bad alike, and set up for themselves a new Church with an altogether new system, as bitter and intolerant as that of Rome herself,³ and described by a not unfriendly writer, Dean Milman, as "a dark domestic tyranny, a sad superstition which refused all light."⁴ For twelve years Knox swayed all Scotland at his will : and the results of his harsh and

¹ On account of his notorious work (A.D. 1556), the "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment [*i.e.* Rule] and Empire of Women," Elizabeth refused to allow him to land in England. The work was answered by Bishop Aylmer of London in A.D. 1559.

² See Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." Preface, ch. ii., for the events which led to the establishment of the Presbyterian "Discipline" at Geneva. Calvin's autocratic rule there began in the year 1541 and lasted till his death in A.D. 1564.

³ See J. R. Green, "Short History," p. 469.

⁴ Dean Milman, "Saint Paul's," p. 269.

narrow doctrinal teaching—however mitigated in practice by the sterling good sense of the Scotch nation—continue there down to the present day. Though an Episcopal Church under immense difficulties struggled into life again in Scotland,¹ all the old Cathedrals and parish churches remain still in Presbyterian hands.²

§ 308. *The Queen and the Pope. Act of Supremacy.*—The numerous exiles³ who now came flocking back from abroad, full of prejudice and violent invective, many of them, against all things Roman whether good or bad, found themselves at once checked and thwarted by the cool, sagacious policy of Elizabeth and the wise councillors whom she gathered round her. But there was no intention of truckling to the power of the Pope; and the violent attitude he assumed towards the new Queen, as Anne Boleyn's daughter, led to the immediate withdrawal of the English ambassador

¹ It was this struggling and sorely persecuted Church which, in A.D. 1784, had the honour of consecrating at Aberdeen the first Bishop for America, Dr. Seabury, at a time when the English Bishops were, through a legal technicality, unable for the moment to act.

² The fifty-fifth canon of A.D. 1604 has been very unfairly quoted, by Macaulay and others, as though implying recognition and approbation of the uncatholic form of ecclesiastical government still unhappily adopted by the majority of our Scotch brethren. But at the date of the canon, Presbyterianism was legally defunct, the system set up in A.D. 1592 having been, after "eight years of intolerable agitation," "abolished by the King with the full consent of an overwhelming majority of the ministers" (A.D. 1600). Scotland was under titular Bishops, and their consecration was then impending. The eventual, but at that time entirely unexpected, restoration of Presbyterianism was due to the harsh and hasty measures of Laud, and dates from A.D. 1638. See Stephens's "History of the Church of Scotland," vol. i., pp. 413-417, and a pamphlet on the subject by Chancellor Harrington (1851). The Church of England has carefully defined her attitude towards *Presbyterianism* in the same series of canons (nos. 6-8).

³ They are computed at eight hundred, and included "the Bishops of Winchester, Bath, Chichester, Exeter, and Ossory; the Deans of Christchurch, Exeter, Durham, Wells, and Chichester; the Archdeacons of Canterbury, Stow, and Lincoln; many other learned divines and preachers; and many laity of distinction."—CANON DIXON, *Hist. Ch. Eng.*, vol. iv., p. 684.

from Rome.¹ The first act of the new Parliament was to restore to the Crown "the ancient jurisdiction over the state Ecclesiastical" (§ 301). It was only with extreme reluctance that the Papal Supremacy had been accepted in the late reign, for, as we have had occasion to notice again and again, the interference of the foreign Pope in English affairs had always been repugnant to English feeling (compare §§ 52, 60, 98, 113, 114, 139, 153, 155, 161-3, 174-5, 186, 198, 231; and see Appendix J). The Act of Supremacy now passed restored to the Crown, with an important limitation,² the exaggerated powers in Church matters which had been wielded by Henry VIII. (§ 233).³ But the title "Supreme Head," which had been abolished under Mary, was at Elizabeth's own desire not revived, because open to cavil and misrepresentation; and the title "Supreme Governor" was substituted for it, as defining more exactly the nature of the power claimed (see § 234), a power which, it is often forgotten, controls Dissent as well as Church.⁴ This title is accordingly the one ever since borne by our Sovereigns. The reactionary statutes of Mary's reign were now abrogated; and those of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.

¹ The Pope at this time was the violent and overbearing Paul IV. (A.D. 1555-9), who had already quarrelled with Mary (above, § 305), and was the great reviver of the Inquisition in countries outside Spain. As Cardinal Caraffa, he had been one of the six Inquisitors-General appointed by Paul III. in A.D. 1542. See also below, § 318.

² Nothing was to be adjudged heresy except by Parliament with the consent of Convocation, unless so adjudged by one of the first four General Councils, or some other Council basing its decisions on the Word of God.

³ These powers were delegated by the Crown to a new Court, that of High Commission, which now came into existence, and which was established on a permanent basis in A.D. 1583 (§ 339).

⁴ See a pamphlet, "How Dissent is Established and Endowed," by Mr. G. H. F. Nye, and compare Art. xxxvii. The phrase, "Free Churches," of which we hear so much nowadays, is unscriptural (p. 7, n. 4), and a ridiculous misnomer for the English sects, which, so far from being "free" from State control, are bound hard and fast by their several trust-deeds. Like the Church of England, they formulate their doctrine, and the State accepts and enforces it when required. It must be so with any religious body which holds property.

were carefully revised and passed anew. Among other salutary things, the election of Bishops by their chapters under a *congé d'écrire* (§§ 161, 227, 279) was finally established, and has ever since remained in operation.

§ 309. *Restoration of the English Prayer-Book.*—The Queen's own strong desire was to restore the use of the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. (see § 290). This proved impracticable from the over-excited state of Protestant feeling after the Marian persecution, and the *Second Prayer-Book* was adopted, with a few very important and significant alterations. The petition against "the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities" was struck out of the Litany: in the Communion Service the manual acts were restored; and the ancient words of administration were re-inserted from the First Prayer-Book, with the *addition* of those which had been substituted for them in the Second Prayer-Book, and thus our present wording was obtained, which so happily embodies both sides of the Eucharistic Mystery:¹ the declaration as to kneeling, which had been at the last moment added on the fly-leaf of the Second Prayer-Book on the sole authority of the Royal Council, was altogether omitted:² and the "Ornaments Rubric" was inserted,³ directing the use of the ancient Church ornaments and vestments, which had been abrogated by the Second Prayer-Book (see § 282, end). This important rubric in its present form (it will be found just before the Order for Morning Prayer) was inserted at the last revision in A.D. 1662: it is very clear and definite in its terms, and is being increasingly observed now that people are learning to

¹ Archdeacon Freeman, "Princ. of Div. Serv." vol. ii., Introd., pp. 135, 136. Compare Archdeacon Wilberforce, "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," pp. 126-128.

² It was, with a very important verbal alteration, re-inserted at the last revision in A.D. 1662, and placed at the end of the Communion Service. See Archdeacon Wilberforce, *op. cit.*, pp. 257, 258.

³ A Table of Proper Lessons for Sundays was also added at this time.

appreciate the wealth of the Catholic heritage preserved to us in our Prayer-Book, and to discriminate between *Catholicity* and *Papery*, two very different things.¹

§ 310. *Its general Acceptance. Royal Injunctions.*—The adoption of the Second Prayer-Book conciliated all but the extreme fanatics among the Reforming party, while the carefully judged additions and corrections were sufficient to satisfy all but the extremists among the Romanisers. And for the next ten years, till the unhappy Papal Bull of A.D. 1570, which brought about, as we shall see presently, the “Roman Catholic” schism, attendance at the parish churches was submitted to by men of all minds “without doubt or scruple,” although of course some endeavoured to keep up the abandoned practices in secret as well. No attempt had been made to lay the restored English Prayer-Book before Convocation, which had been carefully packed with extremists by the late Queen.² And the Act of Uniformity, which enforced its exclusive use, was strenuously opposed by the Marian Bishops in the House of Lords, where it only passed by a majority of three. But it was rapidly and cheerfully adopted throughout the country. Of the great mass of the clergy a very few (168³ out of a total of 9,400) refused to comply with the new regulations. These were deprived by commissioners sent out with wide visita-

¹ “The ceremonies which we have taken from such as were before us, are not things that belong to this or that sect, but they are the ancient rites and customs of the Church of Christ, whereof ourselves being a part, we have the selfsame interest in them which our fathers before us had, from whom the same are descended unto us.”—HOOKER, *Ecc. Pol.* iv. 9. § 1. (See the whole chapter.) “Persons are often perplexed, and naturally so, at the diversities of ceremonial prevailing in our midst. . . . The reason for this state of things is, that in the one case the clergy are obeying the directions of the Ornaments Rubric, whilst in the other case past disuse or prevailing custom is pleaded for disregarding these directions.”—STALEY, *The Catholic Religion*, p. 355.

² See Appendix K, The Reigns of Edward VI. and Mary.

³ To these must be added six Abbots, and fifteen of the Marian Bishops (see below).

torial powers, and with Royal Injunctions which re-published, with some additions and alterations, those of Edward VI. In one of these Injunctions, already quoted, the Queen gave a careful explanation of the Royal Supremacy (see § 234). In another we find enjoined not only reverent kneeling in church during the prayers, but also "*whensoever the Name of Jesus shall be in any Lesson, Sermon, or otherwise in the Church pronounced, that due reverence be made of all persons young and old . . . as thereunto doth necessarily belong, and heretofore hath been accustomed.*"¹

§ 311. *Attitude of the Marian Bishops.*—There had been great mortality in England among the Bishops (§ 305), and besides the Primacy nine of the Bishoprics were vacant at Elizabeth's accession. Of the sixteen surviving Bishops all but one (Kitchin of Llandaff) refused the oath of Supremacy, and therefore under the provisions of the Supremacy Act were deprived gradually of their sees. They were treated with the

¹ This Injunction is repeated and confirmed by the eighteenth canon of A.D. 1604, which adds, "*testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world. . . .*" To the thoughtful Christian this old custom of outward reverence at the mention of the saving Name (Acts iii. 16, iv. 12) in Divine Service is an act of homage (Ps. ii. 12) to our Invisible King, present in our midst (S. Matt. xviii. 20), and is wonderfully helpful, like other such customary Church observances, against wandering thoughts. Compare the eloquent protest of Sir Edward Dering in the Puritan Parliament of A.D. 1640 (Lane, "Illustrated Notes on Eng. Ch. Hist." vol. ii., p. 137): "And must I, Sir, hereafter do no exterior reverence—none at all—to GOD my Saviour, at the mention of his saving name Jesus? Why, Sir, not to do it,—to omit it, and to leave it undone, it is questionable, it is controvertible; it is at least a moot point in divinity. But to deny it,—to forbid it to be done!—take heed, Sir! GOD will never own you if you forbid his honour. Truly, Sir, it horrors me to think of this. For my part, I do humbly ask pardon of this House, and thereupon I take leave and liberty to give you my resolute resolution. I may, I must, I will do bodily reverence unto my Saviour; and that upon occasion taken at the mention of his saving name Jesus. . . ." (See also below, p. 360, and compare p. 46, n. 1).

greatest consideration and leniency, in marked contrast with the very different treatment meted out in Mary's reign to the Reforming Bishops. Of these latter several had saved themselves by flight and exile, and had now returned to England (p. 269, n. 3) to resume their interrupted duties.

§ 312. *Matthew Parker*.—The Queen's choice for the Archbischopric of Canterbury—vacant by the death of Cardinal Pole (§ 305)—fell on Dr. Matthew Parker, who had been Dean of Lincoln and also Master of Bene't (now Corpus Christi) College at Cambridge, till deprived by Mary. In Henry's reign he had stood by the stake of Thomas Bilney (§ 200); and he had been chaplain to Elizabeth's ill-fated mother (a fact by which the Queen was especially drawn to him). In Edward's reign he had remonstrated, at the peril of his life, with the Norfolk rebels (§ 285).¹ In Mary's reign he had lived in strict privacy and seclusion in a friend's house, without leaving England; and he was therefore untainted with the eccentricities in belief and practice brought back by so many of the refugees from abroad, and long destined to trouble and disturb the Church of England. His extreme reluctance to accept the onerous post of Primate was overcome with difficulty; and no better appointment could possibly have been made.

§ 313. *Consecration of Archbishop Parker*.—The Church of England was at this juncture in some danger of losing her episcopal succession, the Reforming Bishops having been either burned or driven into exile in Mary's reign, while those in office under Mary were now being gradually deprived for refusing the oath of Supremacy, and in any case held sullenly aloof from the consecration of the new Archbishop. Dr. Parker was, however, duly consecrated, on Sunday, December 17th, A.D. 1559, in Lambeth Chapel, by

¹ See Fuller, "Ch. Hist." bk. vii., sec. i. 21.

Bishop Barlowe and, in accordance with statute as well as canon law,¹ three other episcopal consecrators, John Scory, Myles Coverdale, and John Hodgkyns. *Barlowe* had been consecrated Bishop of S. Asaph in Henry's reign (A.D. 1536),² and in the year 1548 had been translated from S. David's to Bath and Wells ; on Mary's accession he had been imprisoned, and after a forced resignation of his see, had left England : he was now Bishop elect of Chichester. *Scory* had been consecrated Bishop of Rochester in A.D. 1551, had succeeded Bishop Day at Chichester in the following year, and was now Bishop elect of Hereford. *Coverdale*, the well-known translator of the Bible (§ 240), had been consecrated Bishop suffragan for the Bishop of Exeter in Henry's reign, and had succeeded him at Exeter in A.D. 1551 ; under Mary he had been deprived and imprisoned, but released and allowed to go abroad, through the good offices of the King of Denmark, just before the martyrdoms began.³ *Hodgkyns* had been consecrated Bishop suffragan of Bedford in Henry's reign (A.D. 1537), and, as such, had constantly acted as Bishop Bonner's deputy.⁴ By these four selected Bishops, as co-consecrators, everything was done with extreme care and solemnity, as befitted the importance of the occasion.

¹ The Council of Nicæa (above, § 13) expressly enjoined that not less than *three Bishops* should take part in every consecration.

² Much has been made of the fact that the record of his consecration, like that of many others, as for instance that of Gardiner, is not forthcoming. But he is recognized as Bishop by all his contemporaries, even his enemies, without any doubt or question ; the record of the consecration of many other Bishops has been similarly lost ; and, what is absolutely decisive of the question, Barlowe took his seat in the House of Lords (June 30th, A.D. 1536) a privilege never permitted till after consecration, and also took part in the consecration of other Bishops in Henry's reign. The question indeed was not even raised till, in the interests of Romanism, in A.D. 1616, *forty-eight years after his death.*

³ His wife's sister had married the King of Denmark's chaplain.

⁴ An examination of Bonner's register has shown that of Bonner's sixty-four ordinations no less than sixty were taken by Hodgkyns. He

§ 314. *The “Nag’s Head Fable.” The Anglican Episcopate.*—It has been necessary thus to particularize, because of the eager efforts of Romish controversialists in the next century, and even at the present day, to invalidate, if it were possible, the consecration of Archbishop Parker. It was not till *forty-five years* after the event that one of the exiled Romanists,¹ in a desperate attempt to justify their attitude of schism (see below, § 328), began to set afloat the wild and foolish slander known as the “Nag’s Head Fable,” asserting that the ceremony was performed hastily and ridiculously at the “Nag’s Head,” a tavern, or hotel, in Cheapside.² The evidence as to the actual consecration in the Chapel of the Archbishop’s palace at Lambeth is absolutely complete and conclusive, and this preposterous story has long been given up by all the better-informed Romanist writers as a worthless fabrication.

The existing evidence is thus conveniently summarized by the late Archdeacon Perry: “Of this consecration there remains a long, minute, and detailed account in the register of Lambeth, and a contemporaneous transcript of the consecration part of it in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. There are notices of it also in a great number of diocesan registers; in the registers of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury; in thirty or forty documents in the Rolls; in a large mass of contemporary letters and documents preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cam-

assisted at the consecrations of Bishops in the years 1540, 1541, 1542, and 1547 (Bishop of Bristol, November, 1895).

¹ Holywood, in a controversial book printed at Antwerp A.D. 1604.

² Fuller thus explains, probably correctly, the “small foundation on which this whole report was bottomed”: “Every archbishop or bishop presents himself in Bow Church, accompanied thither with civilians; where any shall be heard who can make any legal exceptions against his election. A dinner was provided for them at the Nag’s Head in Cheapside, as convenient for the vicinity thereof; and from this spark hath all this fire been kindled.”—*Ch. Hist.*, bk. ix., sec. i. 30; compare also bk. xi., sec. i. 70, end.

bridge ; in papers preserved at Zurich, and not known in England till 1685 ; in Parker's own book 'De Antiquitate Britanniae Ecclesiæ,' printed in 1572 ; and in many other places. There would seem to be no historical fact supported by more complete and overwhelming evidence. . . .

"The [Nag's Head] story was absolutely unknown to all the earlier Romish controversialists, as Harpsfield, Hawkins, Saunders, Harding, Bristowe, Allen, Stapleton, Rainolds, and to Bonner himself. . . . It may be added that all fair-minded modern Romanist writers also reject it, as Dr. Lingard and Mr. Tierney (Notes to Dodd)."¹ The Pope himself, in his recent attack on English Orders, significantly passes this tempting story by in total silence.²

We may therefore dismiss, with the contempt it deserves, this strange Romanist cavil against the Church of England. The new Archbishop and his colleagues proceeded to consecrate other Bishops to the vacant sees, and all danger of losing the golden chain of episcopal succession thus passed away. Every ten years the numerous Bishops of our now world-wide communion meet together, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury as Primate of All England, in the LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

§ 315. *Latin Prayer-Book of Elizabeth. The Geneva Bible.*—In A.D. 1560 a very important Latin translation of the Prayer-Book was set forth, by the Queen's authority, for use in the Universities, and at Winchester and Eton Colleges, as well as for the private use of clergymen. In the same year was published a new English translation of the Bible, with numerous notes, which had been prepared at Geneva by the English exiles there during Mary's reign, with the aid of Calvin

¹ "Student's Eng. Ch. Hist." vol. ii., pp. 270, 283.

² He takes refuge in some often-refuted objections to the revised English Ordinal of A.D. 1550. A brief and convenient summary of our whole position is given in the "Priest's Prayer Book" (Masters).

and Beza and other foreign divines.¹ This "Geneva Bible" is also known as the "Breeches Bible" from its quaint rendering in Gen. iii. 7, a rendering which, however, occurs in Wycliffe's old version (§ 170) and also, remarkably enough, in the contemporary "Persones Tale" of Chaucer (§ 167). The Geneva Bible was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, and it obtained an immense circulation, not being finally superseded till some time after the publication of the "Authorized Version" of A.D. 1611, which was itself largely indebted to the Geneva Version.

§ 316. *Metrical Version of the Psalms.*—Here may be noticed the very quaint version of the Psalms in metre, the work partly of Thomas Sternhold in Edward VI.'s reign, partly of John Hopkins, with others, during his exile in Mary's reign—"men whose piety," remarks wise old Fuller, "was better than their poetry." "Sometimes," he adds, "they make the Maker of the tongue to speak little better than barbarism, and have in many verses such poor rhyme, that two hammers on a smith's anvil would make better music."² One of the recent Royal Injunctions (§ 310) had allowed "for the comforting of such that delight in Musick" a hymn at the beginning or end of the daily offices; and this curious doggerel version of Sternhold and Hopkins came gradually into use in default of a proper Church hymn-book.³ Its successor was the hardly less quaint "Tate and Brady" version, which was familiar in the childhood of many still living.

§ 317. *The English Kalendar.*—In A.D. 1561 a revised kalendar was issued,⁴ the minor Festivals to be observed

¹ A translation of the New Testament had already been published at Geneva in Mary's reign, A.D. 1557.

² Fuller, "Ch. Hist." bk. vii., sec. i. 31, 32.

³ The proposal to translate the old office-hymns of the Church was unhappily never carried into effect.

⁴ It is alluded to in the Advertisements of A.D. 1564 (below, § 323), as "the new Kalender authorized by the Queens Majesty."

being selected, mainly from the old Sarum kalendar, by a specially appointed commission. These "black-letter" saints' days are too frequently disregarded and forgotten altogether: in some dioceses there are, however, special Collects, Epistles, and Gospels selected from the Prayer-Book and the Bible and authorized for use on these days.¹ They can at any rate be commemorated in the daily services² by an appropriate hymn, and especially by the use, after the Collect for the day, of the All Saints' Collect. Everyone should try to know something at least of the struggles and victories of the old heroes and heroines of the Faith, some of whom are thus set down for special yearly commemoration in our kalendar. (Compare "Hymns Anc. and Mod.," No. 437; and see below, Appendix P.)

§ 318. Overtures from Rome. *Bishop Jewell.*—The new Pope, Pius IV. (A.D. 1559-65), deplored the reckless harshness and violence of his predecessor (§ 308) endeavoured to repair the breach by conciliatory overtures to Elizabeth, which, however, came to nothing. It is stated on good authority³ that he was willing to sanction the English Prayer-Book as it stood, if only his supremacy might be acknowledged. His invitation to send English representatives to the Council

¹ "Collects, Epistles, and Gospels suggested for use on certain special occasions and Holy Days; dedicated by permission to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Oxford" (Masters).

² "All Priests and Deacons are to say *daily* the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness, or some other urgent cause. And the Curate [*i.e.*, Incumbent] that ministereth in every Parish-church or Chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the Parish-church or Chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's Word, and to pray with him."—BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

³ Lord Chief Justice Coke publicly stated in A.D. 1606 that this had been told him by the Queen herself, and by some of her lords who were greatest in the State and had seen and read the Pope's letter to that effect. Compare § 235 above.

of Trent (§ 322), which was then holding its concluding sessions, was necessarily declined by the queen (A.D. 1561).¹ In the following year the learned Bishop Jewell of Salisbury published his "Apology of the Church of England," explaining and clearing the position and attitude of our Church in refutation of foreign misunderstandings and Romanist slanders. It was quickly translated from its original Latin into most of the languages of Europe,² and was brought to the notice of the Council of Trent. Two years earlier Jewell had thrown down his celebrated challenge to the Romanists in a sermon at S. Paul's Cross. The good Bishop, who was the author of several other works,³ is above all remembered now as the affectionate patron of Richard Hooker, of whom we shall speak presently.

§ 319. *The Thirty-Nine Articles.*—The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, which are for convenience printed at the end of our Prayer-Books, and are still an authoritative standard of doctrinal teaching for the English clergy (they are not binding on the laity), were compiled, as their title states, "for the avoiding of diversities of Opinions, and for the establishing of Consent touching true Religion," and were put forth in the year 1563 by Convocation as the result of a very careful revision of the Forty-Two Articles drawn up ten years before in Edward VI.'s reign (§ 291). The Queen, after nearly a year's delay, ratified them with the insertion in Art. xx. of the clause "The Church hath power to decree Rites, and authority in controversies

¹ A Papal brief was in consequence issued directing the Pope's followers in England to cease attendance at church. The order was, under the pressure of the Act of Uniformity, little regarded: some withdrew into exile, and some were content to temporize. It was not till A.D. 1570 that the final breach came. See below, § 328.

² German, Italian, French, Spanish, Dutch, and even Greek. It was translated into English by Lady Bacon.

³ In A.D. 1570 he wrote a learned confutation of the Papal Bull just issued against Elizabeth.

of Faith" (compare Art. xxxiv.),¹ and with the omission of Art. xxix., which, however, was re-inserted when the Articles were finally settled in A.D. 1571.² It is important to remember that they were not intended to be a *complete* body of divinity,³ but to restrain and guard the authorized teachers of the Church from the promulgation of certain definite errors, Romanist on the one hand and Anabaptist on the other,⁴ and that the language employed in them was of set purpose made exceedingly wide and comprehensive (p. 254, n. 3). It would seem obvious, too, that our Articles, in any case of real or fancied ambiguity, must be explained in accordance with, and not *contrary to*, the later document in which we find the maturest authoritative exposition of our Church's views, the revised Prayer-Book of A.D. 1662. Set forth with the utmost solemnity by the combined action of Convocation, Parliament, and the Crown, this famous Book, which "next to the Bible itself, is the authoritative standard of the doctrine of the Anglican Communion,"⁵ must obviously interpret, where interpretation is needed, the language of the earlier document, and be allowed to elucidate the meaning in which it is intended to be taken. But when this fair and simple rule is attended to, the wild misconceptions and perversions of the Thirty-Nine Articles, which are so frequently put forward by ultra-Protestant and Dissenting controversialists, become at once impossible.

¹ The object was "to assert in strong terms the rights and powers of the Church, with an eye to the position taken up by the Puritan party, who were denying to her the power to decree any rites or ceremonies, save such as could claim direct support from Holy Scripture."—DR. GIBSON, *Thirty-Nine Art.*, p. 32. For a refutation of this Puritan position, see Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." bks. ii. and iii., and compare Canon Curteis, "Dissent in its relation to the Ch. of Eng." pp. 262-264.

² On Art. xxix., see below, p. 330.

³ Dr. Gibson, *l.c.*, and the passage from Bishop Pearson there quoted. This important point has been often forgotten, and the Articles correspondingly misunderstood. See below.

⁴ See Dr. Gibson's work, *passim*.

⁵ LAMBETH CONFERENCE, *Encyclical Letter*, 1897.

§ 320. *The Second Book of Homilies.*—In this same year (1563) appeared, with a preface by Bishop Cox of Ely, “The Second Tome of Homilies of such matters as were promised and entituled in the former part of Homilies,” viz., in Edward’s reign (see § 276). It was compiled by Archbishop Parker and Bishop Jewell, and deals with the subjects of the Right Use of the Church (inculcating a much-needed lesson of reverence); the Peril of Idolatry (directed against Image-Worship)¹; Repairing of Churches; Fasting (an admirable exposition of this Christian duty)²; Gluttony and Drunkenness; Excess of Apparel; Prayer; the Place and Time of Prayer (dealing with Sunday observance and attendance at Church); Common Prayer and the Sacraments, and their administration in a tongue understood of the hearers; Information of certain Places of holy Scripture (in answer to objections brought against the morality of the Bible); Almsdeeds; the Nativity; the Passion, for Good-Friday (a second Homily on the same subject by Taverner [§ 263] is added); the Resurrection, for Easter-Day; the Worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of

¹ This long and curious treatise, founded on one of Bullinger’s, enables us to realize vividly the difficulty of extirpating from men’s minds and memories the idolatrous Saint and Image worship which had so long prevailed (p. 220, n. 2) and to understand better the very violent measures which some of the Reformers then thought necessary (§ 281, end).

² Fasting is defined as “a restraint of meat, drink, and all bodily food and pleasures from the body”: in the Homily of Repentance it is spoken of as a “discipline or taming of the flesh, whereby the nourishments of filthy lusts, and of stubborn contumacy and pride, may be withdrawn and plucked away from it.” It is expounded as one of the three great Christian duties by our Saviour Himself (S. Matt. vi. 1-18): see also 1 Cor. ix. 27. Those who are unable, such as the young, the old, the ailing, are of course exempt from the obligation of the physical fast; but even they can practise other forms of *self-denial*, in which the essence of fasting consists. Unhappily, those who are most in need of the discipline of fasting are the very ones who least regard it, in spite of the express directions of the Prayer-Book, and the express warnings of Holy Scripture that the body must be our servant or it will be our master. See below, Appendix Q, and also Hooker, “Ecc. Pol.” bk. v., ch. 72.

the Body and Blood of Christ ; the coming down of the Holy Ghost, for Whit-Sunday (by Bishop Jewell); the Rogation Days; Matrimony (full of quaint advice to the married); Idleness ; and Repentance. Another Homily of great length—it is divided into six parts—was added by Convocation in A.D. 1571, against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion, in consequence of the northern rising in the year 1569 (below, § 328). This Second Book of Homilies, like the earlier one (§ 276), was designed for the use of the uneducated and unpreaching clergy, of whom there were at this time many. It was authorized by Convocation, and ratified, after a year's consideration, by the Queen.¹ The well-known Table of Kindred and Affinity at the end of the Prayer-Book was now drawn up by Archbishop Parker, on the basis of Holy Scripture.

§ 321. *Foxe's "Book of Martyrs."*—In the year 1563 also appeared one of the most famous books of the Reformation—one that has done more than anything else to keep alive and strong the national abhorrence of Popery—Foxe's “Book of Martyrs.” This well-known compilation cannot be relied on at all for accurate history : but though disfigured by “endless errors” and even “deliberate suppressions of the truth,” it wins the reader by its “mass of facts, and wonderful charm of style,” which “will always give it a great importance.”² John Foxe, a former fellow of Oxford,

¹ It should be noted that the Homilies are not our standards of faith : they merely “contain,” as Art. xxxv. says, a godly and wholesome doctrine ; of their statements a few are erroneous, a few loosely expressed, and a few now long out of date. As an instance of the first may be mentioned the citation of the Apocrypha as the “infallible and undeceivable word of God” (“Of Obedience,” pt. i.) ; and instances of the second and third may be found in the sermon against Peril of Idolatry, which was directed against a condition of things which has passed away. Yet in spite of such occasional blemishes, these Homilies are in many ways very admirable, and are full of “godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times”; and one of the things well worth doing would be the compilation of a handy edition of them, with suitable notes. Compare § 276, and Index, *s.v.*

² J. R. Green, “Short History,” p. 349. “Had Foxe the Martyr-

had been one of the Marian exiles, and had published in the year 1559 a short Latin treatise at Basle, which was the germ of his much more voluminous English work.

§ 322. *The Council of Trent*.—At the close of this year (1563) the Council of Trent (§ 318), which for the unprecedented period of eighteen years had dragged out its strange existence, came to an end. It had been with much reluctance convened by Pope Paul III. in the year 1545 (p. 233 n.), under pressure from the German Emperor, Charles V.; and its sessions had been several times interrupted by disputes between the Pope and the Emperor. After the first fifteen months of session it did not meet again for four years; it reassembled in A.D. 1551; after three years it was suspended again: eight years later it was brought together anew by Pope Pius IV., the final session taking place in December, A.D. 1563. This protracted and stormy Council published a series of decrees, which are looked upon as authoritative in the Roman Communion, the substance of them being afterwards embodied in the famous “Creed of Pope Pius IV.,” published as a Papal Bull in November, A.D. 1564. By this new “Creed” every Romanist is bound, on peril of his salvation, to believe, among other things, Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Veneration of Relics, Image-Worship, and the assertion, which every page of early Church history refutes, that “the Roman Church is the mother and mistress of all Churches.” Neither

ologist been an honest man,” says the learned Professor Brewer, “his carelessness and credulity would have incapacitated him from being a trustworthy historian. Unfortunately he was not honest; he tampered with the documents that came into his hands, and freely indulged in those very faults of suppression and equivocation for which he condemned his opponents.” “It is perhaps hardly necessary to say,” remarks Archdeacon Perry, “that John Foxe will not be relied upon as an historical authority in this work.”—*Student’s Eng. Ch. Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 10, n. 2.

the Eastern Church nor our own took any part in the Council, which has therefore no title to be styled, as Romanists venture to style it, *Œcumical*. It was no free Council representing, as in old days, the Christian Church Universal (see § 54), but a small and carefully-packed body of adherents of the Papacy, entirely dominated by the new Jesuit influence (see below, § 336). “The Council seldom reached the number of fifty prelates; to whom must be added a body of assistant divines, about thirty in number, mostly friars.”¹ It effected a vast practical reform by sweeping away the worst of the many corrupt abuses which had so long made the name of Rome a byword. But its doctrinal decrees, so often appealed to by modern Romanists, can bind only their portion of the Catholic world, and that only till reviewed and revised by a true General Council of united Christendom, meeting according to the ancient precedents and free in its deliberations. The day when such a Council shall be possible is yet far distant: but to it the Church of England has always looked forward for the settlement of her controversy with the Pope (p. 46, n. 2). Neither the Eastern Church nor ourselves can ever consent to exalt the occupant of the Papal chair to the giddy pinnacle on which modern Romanism has ventured to place him, in defiance alike of Scripture and of primitive practice, and at the cost of the Church’s ancient unity (§ 97, end).

§ 323. *Archbishop Parker’s “Advertisements.”*—The Queen was very greatly vexed and angered by the slovenly and disorderly way in which many of the clergy now performed Divine Service, in many cases even objecting to wear any special dress during their ministrations. At the beginning of A.D. 1565 she wrote sharply to the Archbishop, requiring him and the other Bishops to take steps to repress the disorder

¹ Canon Dixon, “Hist. Ch. Eng.” vol. ii., p. 371.

and want of uniformity in the Church services, which gave widespread offence, and occasioned much slander in foreign countries. Archbishop Parker's "Advertisements" were therefore put forth by him¹ in the following year, after he had long and vainly tried to induce the Queen herself to authorize and issue them. They mainly followed the Injunctions of A.D. 1559 (§ 310), but in addition expressly ordered, as essential, the use of a "comely Surplice with Sleeves" at all services, and in Cathedrals and collegiate churches the cope at Holy Communion. The minimum of ritual thus laid down was all that the Archbishop felt it expedient at this time to actually enforce: and the Queen, who strongly desired the restoration of a more ornate ritual, carefully avoided any formal sanction of the "Advertisements," lest they should be supposed to supersede by their promulgation the Ornaments Rubric (§ 309), which remained untouched and unrepealed in the Prayer-Book, the "further order," spoken of in its then wording, never being taken by the Queen.

§ 324. *The Point at Issue.*—Archbishop Parker had thus conceded to the prevalent fanaticism (§ 308) as much as could be conceded without giving up the point at issue altogether. The surplice in ordinary ministrations, and the cope at Holy Communion in Cathedrals, seemed the irreducible minimum if a distinctive dress "for glory and for beauty" was to be worn by the minister at all.² On that minimum the Archbishop wisely took his stand; while the Ornaments Rubric still remained in the Prayer-Book await-

¹ They are subscribed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of London, Ely, and Rochester, as "Commissioners in Causes Ecclesiastical," and by the Bishops of Winchester and Lincoln, "with others."

² The Puritans, as is well known, disliked the use of all vestments of any sort, and wished to perform all religious ministrations in their ordinary dress. Hence the *wearing of the surplice* became a test question, involving the whole question at stake.

ing happier times, when the mists of prejudice should vanish, and men be able to see that the use of the old-time vestments and other "ornamenta," the common heritage of all branches of the Church alike from early Christian days,¹ had no essential connection with the corrupt dogmas of Rome.

§ 325. *Enforcement of Clergy Discipline. The first Dissenters.*—Having thus provided the necessary basis for discipline by his "Advertisements," the Archbishop had now the difficult and ungrateful task of enforcing them—difficult not only from the laxity and hesitation of many of the Bishops, but also from the secret support which a strong anti-vestment party received from the Queen's powerful favourite, Lord Leicester (p. 297, n. 3). The deprivation of thirty-seven London ministers for contumacy caused an outburst of indignation at Cambridge (then a stronghold of those who now began to be known as Precisans, or *Puritans*) and elsewhere. A few of the ministers thus deprived for non-conformity broke away altogether from the Church, and set up a rival worship, in spite of the strong remonstrances not only of their brethren, but even of the foreign Reformers, especially John Knox and Beza, Calvin's successor at Geneva. For practically the first time in her history, therefore, England now saw (A.D. 1568) a spectacle which has, alas, long ceased to be strange, though it can never cease to be sinful—the gathering of congregations into *schismatical places of worship*, and the consequent break-up (we may hope not for ever) of the ecclesiastical unity of the nation, preserved through so many centuries. The mischief, once begun, rapidly progressed, as we shall see hereafter.

§ 326. *The Bishops' Bible.*—Early in the reign the Archbishop had taken steps to obtain a fresh revision of the English Scriptures. This was completed and

¹ See "The Congregation in Church" (Mowbray), ch. vi.

published in A.D. 1568, and a second edition four years later : it is known as the Bishops' Bible, eight of the fifteen revisers being Bishops; and as Parker's Bible, because due to the initiative, and formed under the superintendence of, the Primate. It was a revision of the Great Bible of Henry VIII.'s reign (§ 263), and was intended to displace the popular Geneva Version (§ 315), whose usefulness was seriously marred by the Calvinistic tone of its notes. The Bishops' Bible was read in our churches until after the publication of the Authorized Version in A.D. 1611 ; but it did not succeed in supplanting the Geneva Bible in the homes and affections of the people.¹

§ 327. *Mary, Queen of Scots. Her flight to England.* —In this year, 1568, came the flight of Mary, Queen of Scots, to England. She was a Romanist in religion, and, being grandniece of Henry VIII.,² was, after Elizabeth, next in succession to the English Crown. In A.D. 1561 she had returned from France (at the death of her husband, Francis II.) to her own country, Scotland ; and in spite of her religion the whole Scotch nation had gathered round their beautiful young Queen (she was only eighteen) in a fervour of loyalty. The Papal brief of the year 1562 (p. 280, n. 1) was followed the very next year by a conspiracy of the two Poles, nephews of the late Cardinal, and some others to dethrone Elizabeth, and proclaim Mary Queen of England ; and this peril led to the passing of a second, and very severe, Act of Supremacy by the English Parliament. Then came, A.D. 1565, Mary's marriage with her cousin, Lord Darnley, who was next in

¹ The Prayer-Book and New Testament were translated into Welsh in A.D. 1567, and the whole Bible in A.D. 1588 by Morgan, Bishop of Llandaff and afterwards of S. Asaph. His translation was revised in A.D. 1620, and has ever since remained the standard of the Welsh language.

² Henry VIII.'s elder sister Margaret was married to King James IV. of Scotland, and their son, James V., was the father of Mary.

the line of Royal blood,¹ followed by the birth of a son (the future James I. of England) the following year. This marriage had united the whole forces of Romanism against Elizabeth, who persistently refused to marry, and whose life therefore was the sole frail barrier against the dreaded reign of a second Romanist Queen. But the dark tragedy of Darnley's death in A.D. 1567, and Mary's guilty marriage with his murderer, the Earl of Bothwell, shattered all her fair prospects, and ended in her compulsory abdication, and finally her flight to England, with the terrible charges of murder and adultery hanging over her. For long years she languished in an English prison, the centre and rallying-point of all the hopes of the English Romanists, and of the successive plots against Elizabeth's life, and a constant source of terrible perplexity and danger to the English Queen.

¹ Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, was grandson of Henry VIII.'s sister Margaret and her second husband, the Earl of Angus.

CHAPTER XVII

REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH (CONCLUDED). RESTORATION OF EFFECTIVE DISCIPLINE. RISE OF DISSENT

“Can any thoughtful Christian man who looks forth to-day upon the Continents of East and West have any doubt what Church it is that must stand foremost in the years to come in the task of making the kingdoms of this world the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ? Can any one doubt that the principles of the Church of England are the principles that under God’s good hand will in the long run prevail? The fullest appeal to Holy Scripture in the hands of all her people, a reverent care for Catholic antiquity, and the sacramental teaching of the Church of the first days, completest and frankest sympathy with modern science where it is science, and modern progress where it is progress, largest liberty of private judgment, a firm rejection of the superstitions which darkened mediæval Europe, and which disfigure the Church of Rome to-day; these surely are the lines on which the Church, the advancing Church of the twentieth century, must stand and move and win new races to the Lord.”—BISHOP OF ROCHESTER, June, 1895.

“It is on the injury done to our religion, to Christ’s holy and august religion, that I rest my case. Dissent has impaired its appearance, arrested its progress, weakened its authority, silenced its voice: it is doing all this to-day. It has made this gracious religion a laughing-stock, a scorn and derision to them that are round about us; it has taught its enemies to insult and to blaspheme; it has furnished them with an excuse for deriding its claims. ‘It is a matter of merriment,’ says a Hindoo, writing in the ‘Times,’ ‘to see the different sects of Christians here keeping up an incessant warfare with each other.’ ‘My sons,’ said an old African chief, ‘want me to be baptized. I say to them, “Christians here won’t speak to Christians there.” When one of them has converted the other, it will be time to come to me.’ And from all parts of the mission-field we hear the same complaint. ‘The Christianity of our outpost settlements,’ says Dr. Barry, late Primate of Australia, ‘is simply being destroyed by our divisions.’ ‘In our present divided state,’ says a venerable Presbyterian missionary, Dr. Williamson, ‘we will never Christianize China, never.’ ‘The world,’ writes Dr. Milligan, ‘will never be converted by a disunited Church.’”—CANON HAMMOND, August, 1894.

§ 328. Rebellion in the North. The “Roman Catholic” Schism.—Mary Queen of Scots had fled from her subjects into England, and was now a prisoner at Carlisle. She steadily refused to submit to trial; and the Scotch Regent, her half-brother the Earl of Murray, as steadily refused to allow her to return till she was cleared. The danger of her presence in this country was quickly shown by a formidable rising of Romanist nobles in the north to dethrone Elizabeth (A.D. 1569); and although, being utterly out of sympathy with the temper of the nation (§ 307), the movement collapsed and altogether failed, Pope Pius V. (A.D. 1566-72) selected this very difficult and dangerous juncture for an act by which he broke off communion with England, and founded the “Roman Catholic” sect in this land (A.D. 1570). He published against the English Queen, who was already being regarded by her subjects with a passion of devoted loyalty, a Bull of excommunication and deposition, solemnly cursing her in the face of Christendom, declaring her “deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever,” absolving her subjects from their oath of allegiance, and excommunicating all who should remain faithful to her!¹ The result of this outrage was not quite what the Pope had anticipated; the bulk of the nation rallied faithfully round the Queen, and it merely drew apart the few who (chiefly in the north and the extreme west, at that time the poorest and least populated parts of the kingdom)² thought themselves obliged to obey the Papal mandate, separate themselves from their parish churches and clergy and

¹ Compare § 134. This Bull was solemnly renewed and confirmed, on the eve of the sailing of the Spanish Armada (§ 340) by Pope Sixtus V., who at the same time appointed Allen (§ 337) Cardinal. For the Romanist “Admonition” to rebel and aid the Spaniards, which was issued at the same time of crisis, see Fuller, “Ch. Hist.” bk. ix., sec. vii. 24.

² J. R. Green, “Short History,” p. 406.

the bulk of their countrymen, and commence the “Roman Catholic” schism. The new-born sect, known then as *Papists* or *Recusants*, had no Bishop (except for six years in the next century, A.D. 1623-8), until the reign of James II.;¹ and its modern members, the “Romanists” or “Roman Catholics,” as they are now termed, have no continuity, either legal or ecclesiastical, with the National Church which they forsook.² In the present century they have received, like the other sects, permission to do much as they like; and under the government of intruded Bishops³ the Roman Catholics carry on an active system of proselytism in our midst. But now that the essential Catholicity of the Church of England, preserved amidst all the storms of the Reformation period, has become more fully understood and appreciated, the strange impulse to “join the Church of Rome,” widely felt and acted upon fifty years ago, has lost its force; indeed, many who had too hastily abandoned their Church, and not a few brought up in the “Roman Catholic” body itself, have learned to realize their schismatical attitude, and have gladly returned to the old Mother Church of the English race (§ 63).

§ 329. *Peril of Elizabeth from the Papal Bull.*—By the Roman canon law, those who in “zeal for the Church” kill an excommunicated person, are “not murderers.”⁴ The terrible, and we must add *foreseen*,

¹ They were at first governed by Jesuits and missionary priests under the superintendence of Cardinal Allen (below, § 337) in Flanders, and in A.D. 1598 were placed under an “arch-priest,” Robert Blackwell.

² In a formal document issued in the year 1826 the present Romanist body expressly disclaimed any “right, title, or pretension” with regard to the “revenues and temporalities of the Church Establishment.” That the property of the Church of England is, and always has been, her own, and never belonged to Rome in any sense whatever, has been repeatedly shown in the course of these pages.

³ The present system of intruded Romanist Bishops with territorial titles was set up in England by a Bull of Pope Pius IX. as recently as the year 1850.

⁴ “Can. Excommunicatorum,” xlvi., Caus. xxiii.

result of the Papal action, therefore, was that henceforward the life of Elizabeth was a mark at which every Romanist fanatic might aim, secure, whether successful or not, of ecclesiastical approbation. This, of course, added immensely to the perils which environed the Queen; and the importance of it will be seen shortly. It is satisfactory to be able to note that the issue of this ever-memorable Bull "Regnans in Excelsis" was deplored and disallowed by the better-affected of the English Romanists, who, at the supreme moment of peril in A.D. 1588, did not hesitate to range themselves on the side of Queen and country.¹

§ 330. *Other Forms of Dissent.*—Of other Dissenting bodies at this time the chief was that of the *Brownists*, so called after their founder, Robert Brown, an eccentric Norfolk clergyman, who, after frequent imprisonments for violent and seditious language, and a long exile in Holland, finally rejoined the Church, and died in possession of a benefice.² They were afterwards known as *Barrowists*, from another leader, Henry Barrow, who was hanged in the year 1593 under the libel law of A.D. 1581. They objected equally to Episcopacy and to Presbyterianism (§ 307), and made every congregation—with a membership rigidly confined in each case to a select coterie of "saints"—*independent* of every other, so as to be a law unto itself both in doctrine and discipline. To them must be traced the modern heresy of so-called "Undenominationalism," which aims at *perpetuating* the unhappy divisions among us, as though religious unity were impracticable, and not even to be

¹ Lord Howard of Effingham, a Romanist, led the English fleet which fought the Armada (§ 340). It may be observed that the Act of A.D. 1563 (§ 327) expressly exempted the temporal lords of Parliament from the Supremacy oath, because "the Queen's Majesty is otherwise sufficiently assured of their faith and loyalty."

² He was a relative of Lord Burleigh; and Fuller, who was born close by his parish (Achurch in Northamptonshire), states that he often, when a youth, beheld him ("Ch. Hist.", bk. ix., sec. vi. 5).

desired.¹ During the great Civil War in the next century they became notorious under the name of *Congregationalists* or *Independents*; and after the overthrow of the Church and Monarchy, they had matters in their own hands almost entirely till the Restoration in A.D. 1660. In the present reign, however, there was nothing as yet to show the gigantic mischief which, by taking advantage of a remarkable political and ecclesiastical crisis, they were one day to work.² There were also, at this time, bodies of *Anabaptists* and *Familists*, chiefly consisting of foreigners, and numerically unimportant: the former had already drawn upon themselves severe punishment for their wild revolutionary tenets (§ 286); the Familists, or Family of Love, were an offshoot from the Anabaptists, distinguished by certain mystical views, and in some respects precursors of the later *Quakers*.³

¹ See above, §§ 1, 7, 15, and below, Appendix R. It is hardly necessary to say that this *Polychurchism*, as it might more accurately be called, is essentially different from what we know as *toleration*. The latter rightly leaves to every man the responsibility of choosing his belief without compulsion; he may be any sort of Christian, or a Mohammedan, or a Swedenborgian, or an atheist, or anything else he pleases. But the recognition of "Undenominationalism" violates a fundamental principle of Christianity, the need of *outward unity*, on which such stress is laid by our Lord and His Apostles. Compare the second heading to this chapter.

² We have not here to unravel the intricacies of Charles I.'s lamentable reign, in which the great political struggle—shared in fully by English Churchmen, although not, alas, by their Court-appointed Bishops, § 227—for the old constitutional liberty lost under the Tudors (§ 190) was blended almost inextricably with a determined attempt to establish Calvinistic Presbyterianism. The inevitable failure of the latter (p. 304 n.) led to a period of wild ecclesiastical anarchy without parallel in our history, which absolutely sickened the nation of Puritan domination, and helped largely to bring about the glad Restoration of Church and Throne in A.D. 1660. The whole period, with the one that followed it, in which the principle of religious toleration at last slowly worked its way into general acceptance, is of absorbing interest, but lies outside our present limits.

³ Keble's ed. of Hooker, vol. i., p. 148, n. 2. They had first appeared in England towards the end of Edward VI.'s reign. The Quakers, who reject all outward religious ordinances, were founded by George Fox in A.D. 1648.

§ 331. *The Puritan Party, or “Nonconformists.”*—The Puritans (§ 325), on the other hand, rightly shrinking from the sin of schism, remained firm in the membership of the Church of England,¹ and formed a powerful party within her, the more moderate members of which discountenanced all ceremonial in their excessive dread of Popery, while the extremer spirits aimed, not only at the purification of the Prayer-Book from all the “relics of Popery,” as they termed the ancient and godly ceremonies of the Church (§ 288), but the abolition of Episcopacy, and the adoption of the Presbyterian system of Church government and doctrine, which had been established in Scotland (§ 307).

§ 332. *Cartwright and Travers. Puritan pamphlets. Repressive measures.*—The extremer Puritans found fit leaders in the resolute and stiff-natured Thomas Cartwright,² and Walter Travers, well known as the antagonist of Hooker (below, § 342). In A.D. 1570 Cartwright was appointed Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge; and the bitter attacks which he immediately made upon Episcopacy, the Prayer-Book, and the vestments of the Church, led to a controversy with Whitgift (the future Archbishop), then Master of Trinity College, and finally his deprivation and expulsion from the University in the following

¹ “At no time in his history was the Nonconformist or Puritan a Separatist or Dissenter from the Church of England. . . . His whole endeavour was to purify the Church according to his own notions. To have gone out of the Church he would have regarded as abominable sin. He was more bitter than the Conformist in his hostility towards the Separatist.”—CANON DIXON, *Hist. Ch. Eng.* vol. iii., p. 186. By an inaccuracy which leads to much historical confusion, modern Dissenters frequently receive the name *Nonconformists*, which was borne at the period of the Reformation by their strongest and bitterest opponents!

² “No leader of a religious party ever deserved less of after sympathy than Cartwright. He was unquestionably learned and devout, but his bigotry was that of a mediæval inquisitor.”—J. R. GREEN, *Short History*, p. 468, *q. v.*

year. Next, a prominent Puritan member of the House of Commons brought in bills to reconstruct the Church government on the Genevan model (A.D. 1572). They were quashed, however, on the receipt of a peremptory message from the Queen, requiring that nothing should be done without consulting Convocation. Recourse was then had to pamphleteering ; and the "First Admonition" to Parliament, drawn up under Cartwright's supervision,¹ and the "Second Admonition," penned by Cartwright himself, assailed with unprecedented bitterness the whole Church system—doctrine, discipline, and administration—and openly advocated Presbyterianism, a sect of which was quickly added to the growing ranks of Dissent.² The Queen was now effectually roused, and took steps to restore the broken conformity by a "Proclamation," issued in the year 1573, "against the Despisers or Breakers of the Orders prescribed in the Book of Common-prayer," giving strict orders to the "Bishops and other Magistrates" to enforce the laws. Suspected clergy were required to subscribe their approval of the Prayer-Book, the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the Supremacy. The Puritan "Admonitions" were answered by Whitgift, who had now become Dean of Lincoln.

§ 333. *Death of Archbishop Parker.*—The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Parker, passed away in the year 1575. A man of sound, temperate judgment and moderate views, he had guided the Church successfully through a most critical period of her history, and had rendered solid and inestimable service in the quiet evolution of order and discipline out of the chaos of misrule and anarchy in which the events of the two preceding reigns had plunged her. He was rewarded with the deep hatred of the fanatics, who, in their day of temporary triumph, two reigns later, over Church

¹ After his deprivation Cartwright had retired to Antwerp.

² The first English presbytery was set up at Wandsworth, November, A.D. 1572.

and Crown, dug up his bones, and buried them in a dunghill (A.D. 1643).¹

§ 334. *Church Spoliation under Elizabeth.*—The spoliation of Church property which had been begun by Henry VIII., and continued under Edward VI. (§ 281), was systematically carried on by Elizabeth, and forms a very serious blot upon her reign. Her first Parliament had restored to the Crown the first-fruits and tenths of benefices (see § 222) which Mary, to her honour, had given back, A.D. 1555, for Church purposes; and it also passed a statute empowering the Queen to take, at the vacancy of a see, any of the episcopal manors she pleased in exchange for appropriate tithes of equal value,² and many of the Church lands thus obtained were granted freely away to courtiers and favourites.³ Sees were frequently kept vacant to swell the income of the Crown (compare § 104).⁴ And there were also the iniquitous “Commissions of Concealments,” to inquire into the titles of Church lands and property, that by the help of some legal jugglery they might be confiscated, if possible.⁵

§ 335. *Archbishop Grindal. The “Prophesyings.”*—The mild and gentle Edmund Grindal, who was now

¹ At the Restoration they were recovered and reverently reinterred in the chapel of Lambeth Palace (§ 313), with the touching inscription, still existing, “Corpus Matthæi Archiepiscopi hic tandem quiescit.”

² 1 Eliz. c. 19. See above, § 274, iii., and below, p. 322, iv.

³ Leicester, who purposely fomented in secret the divisions of the Church (§ 325), Cecil, Walsingham, Hatton, and Raleigh were among those enriched out of Church spoil.

⁴ A glaring instance of this is the see of Ely, which had actually been kept vacant for nearly *twenty years* when Dr. Heton was appointed to it in A.D. 1600. So, too, Oxford was subjected to “three periods of vacancy, making up forty years in all” (Canon Bright, “Waymarks,” p. 325).

⁵ See Hooker, “Ecc. Pol.” bk. v., ch. 79. “There will be always,” he says in § 16, “some skilful persons which can teach a way how to grind treatably the Church with jaws that shall scarce move, and yet devour in the end more than they that come ravening with open mouth as if they would worry the whole in an instant:”—a statement, of the truth of which we have had experience in our own day.

translated from York to Canterbury, had been chaplain to Bishop Ridley, and was one of the exiles in Mary's reign. He had already, when Bishop of London, incurred the late Archbishop's censure for slackness of discipline in that important post ; and the same fault now attended his Primacy, and rendered absolutely necessary the drastic measures of his successor, Whitgift (§ 339). He came into serious collision with the Queen on the question of the "Exercises" or "Prophesyings," which had been started at Northampton about the year 1571, and were being widely adopted. These were meetings of clergy and laity, held in the churches,¹ for extempore prayer and for discussion of selected Scripture texts ; and the Queen had already ordered their cessation, as, in the way they were conducted, they had an unsettling tendency and helped to breed divisions. The new Primate, who had advocated and encouraged the "Prophesyings," not recognizing their power for mischief in the then state of men's minds, felt it necessary to send the Queen a strong letter of remonstrance and rebuke for her overbearing interference in Church matters, refusing on conscientious grounds his assent to the suppression. The Queen, whose imperious will could ill brook opposition, punished him by obtaining a sentence of the Star Chamber (p. 303, n. 1), which suspended him from the exercise of his jurisdictional powers (compare § 241) ; and the sentence remained in force for about five years, till a qualified apology from him was allowed to end the scandal of this breach with the Queen.

§ 336. *The "Society of Jesus."*—Grindal's bold and much-needed opposition to the Royal will was in every way honourable to the Archbishop, and bore fruit afterwards.² His Primacy is otherwise chiefly

¹ See Fuller, "Ch. Hist." bk. ix., sec. iv. 2, 3.

² The similar remonstrance of his successor Whitgift, which is given in full in Walton's "Life of Hooker" (Keble's ed., p. 43) was accepted

memorable for the coming of the Jesuits. In A.D. 1534 the “Society of Jesus,” or *Jesuits* as they soon came to be called, had been founded, under the strictest possible vows of discipline and unquestioning obedience, by a young nobleman of Spain, Ignatius Loyola, and six years later had been formally authorized by the Pope. The Jesuits set themselves with patient and resistless energy to check and counteract in every possible way, legitimate and illegitimate, the Reformation movement, taking full advantage of the endless divisions and quarrels of the Reformers abroad. Their influence successfully dominated the Council of Trent (§ 322), and bound it hand and foot to Papalism, thwarting altogether the important reforms that might otherwise have been obtained. And the influence, adverse to the Reformation, exercised by the Jesuits in all directions had now become immense.

§ 337. *The Coming of the Jesuits to England. Their Treatment.*—In A.D. 1568 William Allen, formerly a distinguished Oxford graduate,¹ and made afterwards Cardinal (p. 291, n. 1), established at Douai in Flanders a Romanist seminary for the training of English youths to reconvert England to the Papal obedience. Six years later these “seminary priests” began secretly to enter the kingdom, and one of them, Cuthbert Mayne, discovered with a copy of the Papal Bull of Deposition upon him, was executed as a traitor (A.D. 1578). In the year 1581 came the first *Jesuits* to England, Parsons and Campian, and a continuous stream of Jesuit missionaries began to secretly penetrate the country through and through as emissaries of the Pope. The

and acted upon by the Queen. Here it may be noted that the ridiculous letter said to have been written by her to the Bishop of Ely, beginning, “Proud Prelate”—though it has been quoted again and again, and has found its way even into histories of repute—is a mere *hoax*, an eighteenth century forgery which first appeared in the “Gentleman’s Magazine” (Bishop Creighton). For another famous fable of history, see p. 249, n. 1.

¹ Fellow of Oriel, and afterwards “head of St. Mary-Hall, and canon of York” (Fuller).

national dread and horror of Popery (§ 321) had been quickened by the Bull of Deposition in A.D. 1570, and the consequent plots against the life of the Queen ; by the treacherous massacre in France of over *twenty thousand* Protestants on the eve of S. Bartholomew, A.D. 1572, the news of which had been received by the Pope and Cardinals with a public thanksgiving and the striking of commemorative medals ; by the fearful cruelties to the Netherland Protestants in their long, agonizing struggle with the Duke of Alva, then going on, and watched excitedly from England ; and by the actual landing of Papal troops in Ireland in A.D. 1579-80, and the certainty that the hosts of the hated Philip of Spain (§ 300) were soon to be flung against England herself. It was a time of anguish and strained anxiety, which we, who know so well the triumphant issue, can only faintly realize : and there is small cause for wonder that a national panic set in against the Jesuits. Parliament armed the Crown with wide powers, which the government mercilessly used : as advocates of conspiracy against the Queen's throne and life (§ 329), the Romish emissaries were persistently hunted down, and, when caught, were—many of them¹—hanged, drawn, and quartered, with the barbarous execution then the usual punishment of traitors. These Jesuit “martyrs,” as the Romanists term them, were not burned, as the Protestants in Mary's reign had been, for their religion ; they were *hanged by the civil government*, at a time of well-founded national panic, for treason and conspiracy against the Sovereign, as they would be hanged to-day if similar attempts were made by them on the life of Queen VICTORIA.²

¹ Yet many received the Queen's pardon, and were dismissed the country unharmed (Fuller, “Ch. Hist.” bk. ix. sec. vi. 12 and 30). It has been reckoned that about one hundred and seventy suffered for high treason in the twenty-six years between A.D. 1577 and A.D. 1603, exclusive of very many who died in the prisons.

² For this important point, that the executions in Elizabeth's reign

§ 338. Position of the Romanists under Elizabeth. *The Rhemish Testament.*—It is impossible to deny, however, that the Romanist Dissenters (§ 328) were at this time subjected to very rigorous and unfair treatment, including not only money-fines and imprisonment under the Act of Uniformity (§ 310), but very severe treason-laws constantly impending over them, and constant and harassing suspicions directed towards them. Such was the painful position into which the Papal Bull of Deposition had very largely helped to plunge them. Meanwhile, in A.D. 1582, came out a Romanist version of the New Testament from the Vulgate (compare § 200) with copious notes, designed to counteract the Reformation teaching. It is known as the Rhemish Testament, because prepared and printed abroad at Rheims. (The Romanist version of the Old Testament was made at Douai, and not published till A.D. 1609.)

§ 339. Primacy of Whitgift. Restoration of Clergy Discipline.—Grindal, who died A.D. 1583, was succeeded at Canterbury by John Whitgift, Bishop (since A.D. 1577) of Worcester, and formerly Cartwright's great opponent at Cambridge (§ 332). The new Archbishop did not flinch from the vigorous measures necessitated by the notorious laxity of his predecessor, but set to work at once to cope with the rampant disorder within the Church, and restore discipline among the clergy. And it was indeed time. The Puritan leaders, Cartwright and Travers (§ 332), had just drawn up (A.D. 1582) the Presbyterian "Book of Discipline," which is of great

were for the refusal of allegiance to the Sovereign, and not for religious tenets as such, in spite of the highly exaggerated stories current at Rome, we have the express assertion of the Queen's own ministers, Burleigh and Walsingham (see Hallam, "Const. Hist." vol. i., pp. 149, 150, 164), of her successor James I. (*Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance*, "Works," p. 252, and again p. 336), of Archbishop Laud ("Works," vol. vi., p. 54), and others. Thus at the trial of Campian and his accomplices those who were willing to disclaim the deposing power of the Pope were at once pardoned. Hallam, *l.c.* pp. 146, 164.

interest because destined to be revived in the next century and as the "Directory for Public Worship" to be imposed by a rebel Parliament upon the whole nation (A.D. 1643). And some of the Puritan clergy had met together and concerted a plan for introducing the Presbyterian system secretly within the framework of the Church's organization. Against this dangerous, because underhand, conspiracy Whitgift found it necessary to strike and strike hard. The measures taken by him included the resolute enforcement of the three existing tests as to the Supremacy, the Prayer-Book, and the Thirty-Nine Articles (§ 332), and also the establishment on a *permanent* basis of the Court of High Commission, with enlarged powers granted by the Queen under the provisions of the Supremacy Act (§ 308), and with the duty laid upon it of bringing about conformity in the ranks of the clergy, and compelling them, if they really wished to be the Church's authorized teachers, to teach the Church's doctrines. Twenty-four articles were drawn up, and tendered to suspected clergy for their denial on oath.¹ Many ministers were in consequence suspended or deprived; Whitgift showed himself unmoved by the Puritan outcry that followed; and the attempted interference of the Royal Council, and the attacks on the Church in Parliament (December, A.D. 1584, and again in 1586), were entirely foiled by his own active and wise measures and the steady support of the Queen. Discipline was speedily and effectually recovered; and as early as the year 1584 the Archbishop was able to write to the Queen that "the greatest number, the most ancient, the wisest, and in effect the whole state

¹ This was the oath *ex officio*, which "inasmuch as it contravened the generous maxim of English law, that no one is obliged to criminate himself, provoked very just animadversion" (Hallam, "Const. Hist." vol. i., p. 212). But it was the only effectual means available at the moment for discovering and putting down the Presbyterian conspiracy. See also the interesting discussion in Fuller, "Ch. Hist." bk. ix., sec. vi., 51, 52.

of the clergy of the province do conform themselves. Such as are otherwise affected are in number but few, and most of them young in years and of unsettled mind.”¹

§ 340. *The Spanish Armada. Martin Marprelate Tracts. Penal law against Dissent.*—The early years of Whitgift’s Primacy were years of thrilling excitement and danger to England (§ 337). At home plot after plot was levelled at the life of the Queen² (for complicity in one of them the hapless Mary Queen of Scots was brought to the block in A.D. 1587); abroad, the Spanish Armada was slowly gathering to reconquer England for the Pope (§ 328). Yet in the very year of the Armada (A.D. 1588) the Church was attacked by some of the Puritan extremists in a series of the most bitter and virulent pamphlets perhaps ever penned, called the “Martin Marprelate Tracts,” issued from a secret printing press which travelled from place to place. It was at last seized and destroyed; and the two chief libellers³ were thrown into prison. The seditious and disgusting language used in these ultra-Protestant writings produced a profound sensation in the country. A complete revulsion of feeling now set in⁴ and was manifested by the Parliament of

¹ The Court of High Commission, wielding the tremendous powers of the Royal Supremacy (§ 233), however necessary its establishment was as a temporary measure, became afterwards, with its *ex officio* oath, a very serious instrument of oppression, and was, with the *civil* Court of Star Chamber which corresponded to it, swept away in the year 1641 by the rising tide of civil and religious liberty. Its unconstitutional revival by the Romanist James II. helped to bring about that monarch’s fall. The court consisted of forty-four commissioners (privy councillors and others), only twelve of whom were Bishops. Hallam, “Const. Hist.” vol. i., ch. iv., p. 201 and n.

² The Dutch Protestant leader, William of Orange, ancestor of our William III., was actually assassinated, A.D. 1584.

³ John Penry, a Welshman, and Nicholas Udall. The former was liberated, but in A.D. 1593 for further libels he was again arrested and executed. The latter, after condemnation, was pardoned at Whitgift’s intercession, but died in prison.

⁴ See the remarkable letter of George Cranmer to Hooker in A.D. 1598

A.D. 1593, in which a strict penal law was enacted against non-conformity and presence at conventicles. It provided the penalty of imprisonment followed, if submission was not made in three months, by banishment. However unjustifiable in itself—religious toleration, as we know it to-day, was then a lesson unlearnt by any party—this law had at the moment an excellent effect: the country quieted down, the more zealous of the sectaries passing into Holland instead of languishing, as hitherto, hopelessly in English prisons; while the rest were content to await the opening of a new reign.

§ 341. *Character of Whitgift.*—Archbishop Whitgift's prompt and decided measures had availed to unmask and destroy a very dangerous concealed conspiracy among some of the Puritan clergy against the Catholic order and discipline of the Church of England; and from this time forward the grave peril of a hasty religious revolution such as that which had taken place in Scotland (§ 307) passed entirely away.¹ He earned in return the rancorous hatred of the ultra-Puritans and sectaries; and his memory has, like that of Laud afterwards, been loaded by them with much undeserved obloquy. In reality, he was a man of mild and merciful disposition, and, as the historian Fuller, even in the stormy period just after the Civil War, does not hesitate to call him, “*one of the worthiest*

(Keble's ed. of Hooker, vol. i., pp. 599, 600). The libels were effectively answered in their own scoffing style by Thomas Nash.

¹ Presbyterianism “never took any general hold on England.” The Puritan manifesto presented to James I. on his accession “asked for no change in the government or organization of the Church.” “Not one of the leading Puritans of the Long Parliament was a Presbyterian. Pym and Hampden had no sort of objection to Episcopacy, and the adoption of the Presbyterian system was only forced on the Puritan patriots in their later struggle by political considerations,” viz., the necessity of aid from Scotland. “Even in the moment of its seeming triumph under the Commonwealth, it was rejected by every part of England save London and Lancashire and part of Derbyshire.” J. R. Green, “Short Hist.” pp. 467, 470, 477.

men that ever the English hierarchy did enjoy." Whitgift had the full confidence of the Queen, whom he outlived for not quite a year : he died A.D. 1604, just after the Hampton Court Conference, murmuring brokenly with his palsied lips the pathetic words "Pro Ecclesia Dei!" ("For the Church of God!"), words which give the keynote of his life.

§ 342. *A New Era. Spenser and Shakespeare.*
Richard Hooker.—The repulse of the Spanish Armada in the memorable year 1588 is a real turning-point in the ecclesiastical, as in the civil, history of England. With it passed away the last severed hopes of the Romanists, who henceforward became, till the present century, politically and ecclesiastically unimportant. The Church of England, firmly rooted anew in the affections of the people of England, found herself free, now that the scare of Romanism had subsided, to develop afresh the Catholic principles which she had so wisely conserved. In the year following the destruction of the Armada Dr. Bancroft delivered and published his famous sermon at S. Paul's Cross on the duty of trying the spirits;¹ which, followed by the treatises of Saravia and Sutcliffe, the anonymous "Querimonia Ecclesiae," and the works of Bilson² and Bancroft,³ reclaimed for episcopacy the solid ground of Scripture and antiquity,⁴ of which Puritanism had laboured to deprive it. While English poetry awoke to life in Spenser's "Faerie Queen" (A.D. 1590), and Shakespeare, the maturest product of the Renaissance (§ 191), began (in A.D. 1593) that marvellous series of plays which has given him a place abso-

¹ See Keble's ed. of Hooker, pp. lxxiii. and n., and lxvii. ff.

² "The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church" (A.D. 1593). Dr. Bilson, who "carried prelature in his very aspect" (Fuller), became Bishop of Worcester, and afterwards of Winchester.

³ "Survey of the Holy Discipline" (A.D. 1593). Dr. Bancroft became Bishop of London, A.D. 1597; and he succeeded to the Primacy on Whitgift's death in A.D. 1604.

⁴ See above, §§ 4-7.

lutely unique in the world's literature, a humble country parson, Richard Hooker, was writing in his quiet study the famous treatise "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity," the first four books of which he published in the year 1594, and the fifth in 1597. This well-known work, which stands in the very foremost rank of English theological writings, contains a calm and dignified refutation of the Puritan misconceptions (§ 331), and not only from its deep learning but from the majestic flow and cadence of its style, the "stately march of Elizabethan English in its golden time," it holds the position of an English classic.¹ The remaining three books of his treatise, which were ready for the press at his death in A.D. 1600, and one of which (bk. vii.) contains a powerful vindication of episcopacy (see above, p. 6, n. 5), were torn up and burned by two Puritan ministers, who invaded his study for the purpose after his decease. The rough drafts, however, or most of them, were fortunately preserved; and from them the three books were, in a more or less imperfect form, eventually published in the course of the next century, the sixth and eighth books (dealing with the Church's jurisdiction, and the Royal Supremacy) in A.D. 1648, and the seventh book (dealing with the episcopal office and dignity) not till A.D. 1662, after the Restoration. Hooker himself was a Devonshire man, the son of poor parents, but sent to the University of Oxford by the generous aid of Bishop Jewell (§ 318). Losing his fellowship through marriage, he became

¹ Even the bitter Puritan pamphlet of A.D. 1599 speaks of "the sweete sounde of your melodious stile." "So stately and graceful is the march of his periods, so various the fall of his musical cadences upon the ear, so rich in images, so condensed in sentences, so grave and noble his diction, so little is there of vulgarity in his racy idiom, of pedantry in his learned phrase, that I know not whether any later writer has more admirably displayed the capacities of our language, or produced passages more worthy of comparison with the splendid monuments of antiquity" (Hallam, "Const. Hist." vol. i., p. 215). For the synchronism between Hooker and Shakespeare compare the interesting parallel of that between Wycliffe and Chaucer, § 167.

rector of Drayton Beauchamp in the year 1584, Master of the Temple in 1585, rector of Boscombe, near Salisbury, in 1591, and finally of Bishopsbourne, near Canterbury, in 1595. The controversy into which, while Master of the Temple, he was forced with Walter Travers (§ 332), who was afternoon lecturer there, led to the preparation of his great treatise. He patiently and steadily refutes, one by one, the narrow-minded objections of Puritanism, always with the profoundest learning, and with a light touch of gentle humour which can suddenly change, on occasion, to the most biting and scornful irony, the whole work being dominated by that calm common sense, which is characteristic of the English mind at its best.

§ 343. *Growth of Sabbatarianism. The Lambeth Articles.*—The extravagant fanaticism, which seems almost inseparable from Puritanism, and has so constantly marred and spoiled its best work,¹ showed itself, as in other things, so in its treatment of the Christian Sunday. To the publication of a Puritan minister, Dr. Bound, in A.D. 1595, is traced the growth in England of *Sabbatarianism*, which aimed at transferring to the observance of the Christian “Lord’s Day” (Rev. i. 10) all the rigour and restrictions of the ancient Jewish Saturday *Sabbath* (Col. ii. 16; Rom. xiv. 5), making the day, as it is still made by some, a weariness and a burden, instead of a day of “rest and gladness,” of holy worship, of peace and prayer and innocent cheerful recreation.² The importance of this

¹ Compare the wild—sometimes even blasphemous—statements of teetotal fanaticism in our own days, which do much to injure a struggling, and very righteous, cause in the eyes of moderate men. In this, as in so many other things, “overdoing often proves an undoing” (Matthew Henry).

² The right observance of Sunday is a question still keenly discussed. It is clear (1) that the day is God’s day (one day out of seven for His special service) and His worship must be the *first* consideration, (2) that it is His gift to the toiler, for *real* rest and recreation, and (3) that none may spend it in such a way as to *throw work upon others*. If these three principles are borne in mind, the problem may be easily

movement, however, belongs mainly to the two following reigns. The same year, 1595, is memorable for an attempt to impose on the Church of England the tenets of Calvin, who, like Gottschalk in the ninth century (§ 79), had lost the balance of truth with regard to the inscrutable mystery of Predestination. In consequence of a controversy on the subject which arose at Cambridge, Archbishop Whitgift with some divines whom he consulted drew up nine propositions, known as the Lambeth Articles, which exhibit the theology of Calvinism in its harshest and most repulsive form.¹ The attempt, however, completely failed. Owing to the protests of Baro, Overall, Andrewes, and other leading divines, and the declared opposition of the Queen, these Articles were quietly withdrawn and suppressed. Both Universities were at this time strongholds of Calvinistic tenets: but a reaction had already set in, which was destined to produce important results in the next reign.

§ 344. *Parish Registers*.—The keeping of parish registers had first been ordered in Henry VIII.'s reign (see §§ 259, 276). Their great importance and value had now become apparent, and Convocation in A.D. 1597 directed that the old paper ones should be carefully recopied on *parchment*, and each leaf signed by the minister in token of its accuracy, and that all future entries should be made on parchment only. To this order we owe the preservation of many old and deeply interesting parish registers to the present day, although many were lost during the turmoil and confusion of the Civil War and the period of anarchy that followed it (p. 294, n. 2).

§ 345. *Close of the Reign. Final Review*.—On

solved by the individual Christian. Compare our Lord's attitude to the Jewish Sabbath (S. Mark, ii. 27).

¹ Contrast Art. xvii. at the end of our Prayer-Book. A masterly discussion of this deep subject will be found in Hooker's fragment on Predestination, printed in Keble's edition as an Appendix to bk. v.

March 24th, A.D. 1603, the aged Queen, so long the centre of a nation's love and loyalty, passed away. Under her fostering care the Church of England had again "taken root downward and borne fruit upward," in readiness for the storms of the coming century, which were destined to try her to the uttermost, and to teach her, through suffering, the one great lesson she had yet to learn, that those must be *tolerated* who, for whatever reason, choose to go out from her and live in separation, and that she must appeal to the affections and love of Englishmen and to nothing beside. The chains of State domination (§ 233) are no longer needed, and are slowly falling off from her (compare p. 241 n.); and a new era seems to be opening now before her, an era in which it may be hoped some way may be found to end the present rampant sectarianism which is the despair of every thoughtful Christian.¹ We have now passed in review, from the very beginning of Christianity in this land, a thousand years of the long history (§ 1) of the NATIONAL CHURCH of England. She claims as her own all baptized Englishmen, though so many are straying away from her in the manifold paths of modern schism.² From first to last, all down the ages, the hand of GOD has been with her: and the blessing of GOD has rested so abundantly on our nation, because *as a nation* it has honoured and acknowledged Him. (Compare §§ 63, 92.) Even now, when religious disunion is rife and the country is torn with conflicting sects, her influence is powerful for good; and England, while conceding to all, Christian and non-Christian alike, the fullest and freest *toleration* (p. 294, n. 1), has so far clung instinctively to the expression of national

¹ "The world will never be converted by a disunited Church. Even Bible circulation and missionary exertion upon the largest scale will be powerless to convert it, unless they are accompanied by the strength which unity alone can give."—DR. MILLIGAN (Presbyterian), *Resurrection of our Lord*, p. 202.

² See Appendix R, p. 364.

Christianity, which is a heritage from the long-distant past. Is it too much to hope that as the battle against sin and unbelief becomes stronger and ever stronger, and the darkness deepens before the Advent dawn (S. Luke, xviii. 8), the more orthodox among the Dissenters will be found to rally to the help of the Church which some of them too hastily forsook, and many of them too often ignorantly assail?—that they will consent to unlearn their religious errors, sink their religious differences, forget the mutual misunderstandings of the past, and placing themselves under their rightful ecclesiastical officers, the English Bishops (§ 7), unite in *one* great army for the cause of Christ? There is yet time to recover the once Christian State of England from the half-heathenish attitude and lax morality into which our modern religious divisions have allowed it slowly to drift. The battle is worth fighting: upon its success or failure depends, humanly speaking, the whole future of England; but it can only be won by the close organization and disciplined array of the early Christian days (§ 15).

“IN THE NAME OF OUR GOD WE WILL SET UP OUR BANNERS.”¹

“COME THOU WITH US, AND WE WILL DO THEE GOOD.”²

¹ Ps. xx. 5: compare Cant. vi. 4, 10. [“It has always been held by the Church, both before and since His coming, that the Bridegroom of the Song of Solomon, He whose ‘name is as ointment poured forth’ (ch. i. 3), that is, Messiah, the anointed one, is the Christ of God. Truly ‘a greater than Solomon is here.’ He Whose person and work are its principal subjects, and Who, all glorious and all good, forms the central figure in every scene, if indeed Canticles be really part of the Sacred Canon, can be none other than Israel’s Divine King.”—REV. J. NEIL.]

² Num. x. 29: compare Judg. v. 23; Esth. iv. 14.

APPENDIX A

THE THREE ORDERS OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. (See §§ 4-7, 15)

"Take ye heed to the Bishop, that God also may to you. I give my life for them that be obedient to Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons."—
S. IGNATIUS, *ad Polyc.* c. vi. (A.D. 107).

(a) *Bingham on the word "Order."*—"I must premise one particular, to avoid all ambiguity; that I take the word *order* in that sense as the ancients use it, and not as many of the schoolmen¹ do, who, for reasons of their own, distinguish between order and jurisdiction, and make bishops and presbyters to be one and the same order, only differing in power and jurisdiction. This distinction was unknown to the ancients; among whom the words *order*, *degree*, *office*, *power*, and *jurisdiction*, when they speak of the superiority of bishops above presbyters, mean but one and the same thing, viz., the power of the supreme governors of the church, conferred upon them in their ordination, over presbyters,² who are to do nothing but in subordination to them. St. Jerome, who will be allowed to speak the sense of the ancients, makes no difference in these words, *ordo*, *gradus*, *officium*, but uses them promiscuously, to signify the power and jurisdiction of bishops above presbyters and the whole church, which is, properly speaking, the very essence of their order. [Here follow quotations from S. Jerome.] . . . So that it is all one, according to St. Jerome, whether we say the order, or the degree, or the office, or the power and jurisdiction of a

¹ For the Schoolmen, see above, §§ 128, 129, 141, 159.

² See above, pp. 5-7.

bishop ; for all these are intended to express the same thing, viz., the authority of bishops over their presbyters and the whole church. And in this sense I use the word order in this discourse, to express the opinion of the ancients, concerning the different powers of bishops and presbyters in the church."—*Christian Antiquities*, ii. 1. § 1 (A.D. 1708).

(b) *The Epistles of Ignatius.*—“Now that there was such a distinction always observed in the church is evident, first from the testimony of the most ancient writers, who speak of bishops, presbyters, and deacons as distinct degrees in the church, and the two latter as subordinate to the first. The testimonies of Ignatius to this purpose are so full and evident, that nothing was ever pretended to be said against them, save only that they are not the genuine remains of that ancient author ; which *has been so often considered and replied to by learned men, that there is no pretence left to favour such an imagination.*¹ The citations are too numerous to be here inserted at large, and therefore I shall only give the reader a specimen in one single testimony, by which he may judge of all the rest. In his Epistle to the Magnesians, he exhorts them to do all things in unity, under the bishop presiding in the place of God, and the presbyters in the place of the apostolical senate, and the deacons, to whom is committed the ministry and service of Jesus Christ.”—BINGHAM, *I.c.*, § 8. So, again, to the Church of the Trallians he writes, “It is then necessary, as your practice is, that ye *do nothing without the Bishop.* . . . Apart from these [viz., Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons, of whom he has just spoken] a Church *has not even the name*” (*οὐ καλεῖται*). See also the heading to this Appendix. And from his letters numerous other such passages may be adduced.² S. Irenæus (see § 10), a disciple of the venerable S. Polycarp, Bishop of

¹ He cites Pearson, Usher, Voss, and Bull. The question has been examined anew in our own day by Bishop Lightfoot, and by the German critic Zahn, and the genuineness of the seven Epistles of Ignatius to Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, Smyrna, and to S. Polycarp, put beyond all question.

² S. Ignatius wrote a very few years after the death of S. John (compare above, § 10), and nothing can be stronger or more emphatic than his language on the position of the Bishop, and the obedience due to him

Smyrna, who was himself a disciple of S. John, repeatedly appeals to the “*succession of Bishops* tracing their descent from the primitive age, and appointed by the Apostles themselves.” So does Tertullian with equal emphasis about twenty years later. In fact, without overstepping the second century at all, we have evidence for the Apostolic origin of the Episcopate which is overwhelming.

(c) *The Apostolic Succession.*—“Modern ‘undenominational’ writers sometimes ridicule the doctrine of the Apostolic succession of the ministry.¹ It seems to me constantly more surprising how any one can do so who has under his eye the Acts of the Apostles, the Pastoral Epistles, the connection of the Episcopate in Syria and Asia Minor with S. James and S. John, the Epistles of Ignatius, the Epistle of Clement, and the position of the Episcopate in the traditions of Hegesippus and Irenæus. I do not think that a more accurate account of the development of the ministry can be given than is given, in view of those documents, by the Abbé Duchesne in the beginning of his great work, ‘*Origines du culte Chrétien*,’ Paris, 1889, pp. 7-11.”—CANON GORE, *Christian Ministry*, 3rd ed., Pref.

APPENDIX B

THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY. (See § 28)

A.D.

- 597. Augustine (pp. 25 ff.).
- 605. Laurentius (p. 30).
- 619. Mellitus (pp. 26, 29, 30).

from all the faithful. For the reason of his intense earnestness, the imminent danger of religious anarchy, see §§ 7 and 15 above.

¹ *I.e.* the principle that ordination can only be conferred by those who themselves have received authority to confer it (Heb. v. 4, S. John, xx. 21). See Art. xxiii. It is this principle, as old as Christianity itself (Canon Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 301-302) which compels us to regard the position of Dissenting ministers as indefensible, from the point of view of Church order. Compare p. 7, n. 4.

- A.D.
- 624. Justus (pp. 26-30).
 - 627. Honorius (pp. 31, n. 1, 32).
 - 655. Deusdedit (p. 39).
 - 668. Theodore (pp. 39 ff.).
 - 693. Berhtwald (p. 50).
 - 731. Tatwyne.
 - 735. Nothelm.
 - 741. Cuthbert (pp. 56-57, 319).
 - 759. Breogwin.
 - 763. Jaenberht.
 - 790. Ethelhard.
 - 805. Wulfred.
 - 829. Feologild.
 - 830. Ceolnoth.
 - 870. Ethelred.
 - 891. Plegmund (p. 66).
 - 923. Athelm.
 - 928. Wulphelm.
 - 941. Odo (pp. 67-68).
 - 959. Alfsin.¹
 - 959. Dunstan (pp. 67-69).
 - 988. Ethelgar.
 - 990. Sigeric (p. 70).
 - 995. Aelfric (p. 71).
 - 1006. Elphege, or Alphege (p. 72).
 - 1013. Lyfing.
 - 1020. Ethelnoth (the Good).
 - 1038. Eadsin.
 - 1050. Robert of Jumiéges (p. 74).
 - 1052. Stigand (pp. 75, 82).
 - 1070. Lanfranc (pp. 82 ff.).
 - 1093. Anselm (pp. 86 ff.).
 - 1114. Ralph d'Escures (p. 94).
 - 1123. William de Corbeuil (pp. 94-95).
 - 1139. Theobald (p. 98).
 - 1162. Thomas Becket (pp. 102, ff.).
 - 1174. Richard of Dover (p. 110).
 - 1184. Baldwin (pp. 110-111).

¹ Died on his way to Rome for the Pall.

A.D.

1193. Hubert Walter¹ (p. 111).
 1207. Stephen Langton (pp. 114, ff.).
 1229. Richard Grant (le Grand).
 1233. Edmund Rich (p. 120).
 1245. Boniface of Savoy.
 1272. Robert Kilwardby (p. 132).
 1279. John Peckham (p. 132).
 1294. Robert de Winchelsey (p. 133).
 1314. Walter Reynolds.
 1328. Simon de Meopham, or Mepeham.
 1333. John de Stratford.²
 1349. Thomas Bradwardine³ (p. 141).
 1349. Simon Islip.
 1366. Simon Langham.
 1368. William Whittlesey.
 1375. Simon de Sudbury (p. 153).
 1381. William Courtenay (p. 153).
 1396. Thomas Arundel⁴ (p. 157).
 1414. Henry Chicheley (pp. 160, 165, 263).
 1443. John Stafford.
 1452. John Kempe (p. 168, n. 2).
 1454. Thomas Bourchier (p. 168, n. 2).
 1486. John Morton (pp. 168, n. 2, 185).
 1501. Henry Dene (p. 333).
 1503. William Warham (pp. 176, ff.).
 1533. Thomas Cranmer (pp. 195, 201, ff.).
 1556. Reginald Pole (p. 265).
 1559. Matthew Parker (pp. 274, ff.).
 1576. Edmund Grindal (pp. 297-298).
 1583. John Whitgift (pp. 301, ff.).
 1604. Richard Bancroft (p. 305, n. 3).
 1610. George Abbott.
 1633. William Laud⁵ (pp. 269, n. 2, 304).
 1660. William Juxon.

¹ Reginald Fitz Jocelin, Bishop of Bath, was first appointed, but died a few weeks afterwards.

² Born at Stratford-on-Avon, where he founded a college.

³ John de Ufford, Dean of Lincoln, who was first appointed, died before consecration.

⁴ Roger Walden was intruded for a time in A.D. 1398.

⁵ Beheaded on Tower Hill, Jan. 10th, 1645. Compare below, p. 360

A.D.	
1663.	Gilbert Sheldon.
1678.	William Sancroft.
1691.	John Tillotson.
1695.	Thomas Tenison.
1715.	William Wake.
1736.	John Potter.
1747.	Thomas Herring.
1757.	Matthew Hutton.
1758.	Thomas Secker. ¹
1768.	Frederick Cornwallis.
1783.	John Moore.
1805.	Charles Manners Sutton.
1828.	William Howley.
1848.	John Bird Sumner.
1862.	Charles Thomas Longley.
1868.	Archibald Campbell Tait.
1883.	Edward White Benson (p. 256, n. 1).
1896.	Frederick Temple (p. 26).

APPENDIX C

THE PAROCHIAL SYSTEM. (See § 57)

The Church's parochial system was naturally of slow and gradual growth. We hear of churches built and clergy ordained for them before the time of Archbishop Theodore : Paulinus at Lincoln, S. Aidan in Northumbria, and Birinus in Wessex built churches (*Bede*, ii. 16, iii. 3, 7); Bishop Cedd, in Essex, built churches and ordained clergy "per loca" (iii. 22); and Wilfrid of York ordained "in all places" clergy as his assistants (*Eddi*, 21). But Thomas de Elmham expressly asserts that Theodore "*stimulated the devotion of*

¹ Born a Dissenter, and designed by his father for the Presbyterian ministry. But he rejoined the Church of England, on conviction, when grown up; as did also his friend, the yet more famous Bishop Butler, of Durham. Compare Canon Curteis, "Dissent in its Relation to the Ch. of Eng.," pp. 400-402.

the faithful, and their willingness . . . to erect churches and mark off parishes, by obtaining the sanction of the kings to the same; that those who had the ability and the wish to build churches to God's honour on their own estate should enjoy the perpetual patronage of the same.”¹

Thus many of the English nobles were induced to provide² their estates with a church, and a residence with a parcel of glebe land for the clergyman. And, as a further privilege, they were allowed by Archbishop Theodore to give to these churches, where erected, the tithes which, paid regularly as a matter of course by all Christians, went otherwise to the Bishop's central fund.³

Thus in course of time each manor became a parish. And the curious inequalities in our parishes result from this their origin. English parishes differ in area; they differ in amount of endowment; and very frequently we find parcels of land situated at a considerable distance from the parish to which they belong. For the *endowment* of the parish was in each case the result of an arrangement between the landowner, who obtained the patronage, and the Bishop who consecrated, and naturally depended in each case on the amount of the former's means or liberality; while the *boundaries* of the newly-formed parish coincided, as a rule, with the limits of the founder's estate, and included therefore detached pieces of land which *happened to belong to him*.

We find the value of the parochial system fully recognized by Bede,⁴ and by the end of his century parish churches seem to have been very generally established throughout the country.

¹ The principle of *patronage*, which is still such a characteristic feature of the Church of England, was adopted from an earlier law of Justinian (A.D. 541), that any one founding a church, and endowing it with a maintenance for a clerk, might nominate the person to be ordained to it, subject to the Bishop's right of rejecting an unfit presentee.

² See instances in Bede, v. 4, 5. These instances belong to the year 686.

³ Theodore, “*Poenit.*” 2. 4. 10, “*Decimas non est legitimum dare [i.e. to give away] nisi pauperibus et peregrinis, sive laici suas ad ecclesias.*” Compare Bede, i. 27. I. See further, Canon Bright, “*Early Eng. Ch. Hist.*” pp. 371, 424, n. 4, 455.

⁴ See his letter to Bishop Egbert, *circa A.D. 734*.

APPENDIX D

TITHES

Tithe is a very ancient form of *reserved rent*, which, as such, does not belong to either landlord or tenant, and would still have to be paid (as now in Ireland) if this old form of Church endowment were to be seized by the State and diverted to secular purposes. Like every other kind of property, it has been secured by legislation from time to time. And, like the property of railways, or of the Bank of England, or of Dissenting chapels themselves, it has been from time to time regulated and controlled, as well as sanctioned and protected, by Parliament. But this, of course, gives the State no *moral* right, except in the last resort, to *confiscate*.¹

So much confusion of thought exists on the subject that it seems desirable to trace, however briefly, the history, somewhat intricate and obscure, of tithe-payment in England.

I. *Before the Norman Conquest.*

(i.) The payment of tithes as a religious duty was of universal obligation throughout Christendom when S. Augustine landed in England, and was therefore, as a matter of course, introduced by him among the new English converts. This is expressly stated in the (so-called) Laws of Edward the Confessor : “ Augustine preached the payment of tithes, which were granted by the king [*i.e.* Ethelbert, King of Kent], and confirmed by the nobles and people.”

(ii.) On the Continent all oblations of the faithful, including tithes, were at that time paid into a central diocesan fund, under the control of the Bishop, who divided it into

¹ There are some who seem actually to hold that Parliament as Parliament, or the nation as a nation, can do no wrong ! Compare Mal. iii. 9 ; and see above, p. 190.

four unequal parts,¹ apportioned at his discretion for the maintenance of his own establishment, the clergy, the poor, and the repair of the church fabrics. This system of division, if it was introduced into England, as to which there is no direct evidence,² never hardened into law, owing to the growth of the parochial system under the stimulus of Archbishop Theodore (see Appendix C). Laymen were allowed by him to pay the tithe to "their own churches,"³ instead of the central fund.

(iii.) The Council of Chelsea (A.D. 787) insists upon the payment of tithes as a Christian duty.⁴ That they were still, in many cases at least, being paid into the Bishop's fund, we learn from an incidental allusion in S. Boniface's letter to Archbishop Cuthbert between the years 746 and 749.

(iv.) The King of Mercia, Offa, made a special grant of a tenth of his possessions in penance for a murder; but this has of course nothing to do with the payment of tithe. The spurious "Excerpts of Archbishop Egbert" mention a threefold division of tithe; but they are not Egbert's at all, and have no right or title to represent English law or custom.⁵ The Donation of King Ethelwulf, again, "had nothing to do with tithe,"⁶ though often confused with it. What Ethelwulf granted was a tenth of his own lands and goods, after the just mentioned example of Offa.

(v.) The payment of tithe being a recognized Christian obligation, coeval with the introduction of Christianity into the land, Alfred's treaty with the Danes—renewed afterwards

¹ "Not in an equal proportion, but by a fair apportionment."—CANON JENKINS, *Hist. of Canterbury*, p. 61 (quoting SARPI'S *Trattate delle Materie Beneficiarie*).

² Compare Bede, i. 27. I.

³ Theodore's "Poenitentiale," 2. 14. 10, quoted above, p. 317, n. 3.

⁴ Canon xvii. : ". . . Præcipimus ut omnes studeant de omnibus quæ possident decimas dare, quia speciale Domini Dei est, et de novem partibus sibi vivat et eleemosynas tribuat." This is obviously not a legal enactment (as often represented), but a strong recommendation of a religious duty.

⁵ Lord Selborne, "Facts and Fictions," p. 150. Even Clarke gives this document up ("Tithes," pp. 30, ff.).

⁶ Bishop Stubbs, "Const. Hist." vol. i., p. 228. The evidence of the Chronicles makes it clear that the King's grant referred to lands, and not to tithe of increase.

by Edward the Elder—provides for its due payment by them, as Christians henceforth. In A.D. 928 King Athelstan at the synod of Grantley (Gretanlea), and in A.D. 944 King Edmund at a synod in London, enjoin payment of tithes—evidently on account of its neglect during the fearful struggles with the Danes.

(vi.) Hitherto the Christian duty of paying tithe had been insisted on, but its apportionment left to custom. About A.D. 970, a law of Edgar's attempted for the first time to fix the apportionment of tithe, directing that one-third should be paid to the parish church (if the latter was important enough to have a burial-ground), the rest going to the "original church" of the diocese,¹ *i.e.* to the Bishop's central fund. It is said that Ethelred at a council of A.D. 1014 decreed that the tithes should be divided, in the continental manner, between the clergy, church repairs, and the poor; and this would be in accordance with Aelfric's suggestion in his proposed canons about A.D. 994. But this remarkable attempt (if really made)² to introduce the tripartite division of tithes at the close of Ethelred's unhappy reign, was ignored immediately afterwards by Canute, who reverted to the law of Edgar, which he confirmed and re-enacted;³ and so matters rested till the Conquest.⁴

II. After the Norman Conquest.

(i.) William the Conqueror, in confirming the laws, rights, and customs of his new subjects, expressly provided for the recovery of tithe in the new ecclesiastical courts set up by him (§ 101). And the practice now became frequent of landowners making definite grants of their tithes in per-

¹ The "eald mynster," "primeria ecclesia," *i.e.*, the original central church or Cathedral. Compare above, § 43.

² The decree was regarded as spurious by the great Anglo-Saxon scholar, Richard Price.

³ That the poor never had in England *legal* right (as is sometimes pretended) to a share of the tithe is certain. See Rev. R. M. Fuller, "Our Title Deeds," pp. 135-142.

⁴ Hence in Domesday Book we find some churches in possession of only this third of the tithes from the manor or township.

petuity to some monastery. That tithes were so granted to *parish churches* has been disputed, but is proved by the still-existing deeds of endowment of two ancient parish churches with their full tithes at their consecration in the reign of Henry I.¹ It was one of the duties of Bishops to see that an adequate endowment was forthcoming before granting to the landowner the privilege of the consecration of his new parish church (p. 317). And it must be remembered that only after the Norman Conquest the formality finally prevailed of a written legal deed executed by the owner of the land, grants before the Conquest being frequently made only by word of mouth and some symbolic action;² and also that while the deeds of endowment belonging to a monastery were laid up and carefully preserved by the monks, those belonging to a parish were constantly liable to loss or destruction.

(ii.) However this may be, it is at any rate certain that *as early as Henry II.'s reign* all the ecclesiastical profits of the parish went, as a rule, to the incumbent.³ Accordingly, from and after the end of that century the legal presumption (in the absence of proof to the contrary) has always been that the tithes of each parish belong of common right to the rector.

(iii.) When a landowner made a perpetual grant of a benefice and its tithes to some monastery or other corporate body (a practice which became very general after the Norman Conquest), the monastery appointed a *Vicar* or substitute to perform the necessary ecclesiastical duties, and retained in its own hands the "great" or rectorial tithes, while the Vicar, by a practice which gradually grew into a legal right, received the "small" tithes for his maintenance.⁴

¹ Exhall in Warwickshire, and Hay in Brecknockshire. The monks were both far more careful to have a written deed, and far more careful in its preservation when obtained, as is pointed out in the text; and this sufficiently explains why the chief grants of tithes still extant are found to be to monasteries.

² Lane, "Illustr. Notes on Eng. Ch. Hist." vol. i., pp. 106, ff.

³ This is shown by a decretal epistle of Pope Alexander III. to the Archbishop of York respecting the subdivision of a parish. Another epistle of the same Pope recites the custom of the Church of England to be that every parishioner should pay his tithe-corn to his own parish.

⁴ At first the monastery gave its vicar just what it liked. The Westminster Synod of A.D. 1200 ordered a "decent competency." The

"By the time of the Reformation about half of the livings of England and Wales had thus become inappropriate to monasteries, cathedral chapters, corporations, guilds, etc."¹

(iv.) At the wholesale spoliation in Reformation times, all such tithes in the hands of monasteries and guilds were, with the rest of the monastic property, seized by the Crown : and they were many of them actually granted away to individual laymen or to lay corporations, in whose possession, as "Lay Rectors," they still remain (§ 274, iii.). But in numerous cases Bishops or Cathedral chapters were forced by law to surrender landed Church estates in exchange for these tithes, and thus *purchase them from the Crown* by a system of forced exchange, the Church lands thus obtained being then granted away, many of them, to Royal favourites and dependants. As has been remarked above (p. 236), tithes thus acquired are doubly the Church's own, first by right, and secondly by forced purchase from the State.

(v.) In all cases where tithes had not been granted away by the landowner to some religious corporation, they remained untouched, even at the Reformation, and have continued so down to our own time. In the year 1836, however, they were all commuted for convenience into a permanent *rent-charge* upon the land, varying according to the averages, in the previous seven years, of the price of *corn*. Owing to the steady fall in the price of corn, the effect has been to virtually disendow a large and increasing number of parishes, and to bring those clergy who have no private source of income into deep and bitter need.²

Lateran Council of A.D. 1215 ordered the appointment of vicars to all churches thus held by monasteries ; and the Council of Oxford seven years later fixed their payment at five marks, the Bishop to settle the charges of the church as between rector and vicar. In A.D. 1342 Archbishop Stratford ordered the *monasteries* to distribute a portion of the tithes among their poor parishioners, and this was confirmed by the Statute of Westminster in A.D. 1391 (15 Rich. II. cap. 6).

¹ Cutts, "Middle Ages," p. 199.

² The common delusion as to *wealthy livings* in the Church is fostered by the invariable practice of quoting in the newspapers the gross nominal value, which is two or three times the real value to the unfortunate incumbents, when the numerous outgoings with which they are burdened are settled. The true state of things is as yet far from adequately realized (Gal. vi. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 7, 11, 13; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18).

(vi.) Thus, then, all tithes now in possession of the Church, if they were once *monastic*, were purchased by her from the State under compulsion at the Reformation; and if they were not monastic, belong to her parishes by a prescriptive title and uninterrupted right of, at the very least, *seven hundred years*. In the case of Dissenters, a tenure of *twenty-five years* is sufficient to give a legal title to property and endowments (Dissenters' Chapels Act, 7 and 8 Vic. cap. 45): and the right of Church corporations to their tithes may, by every principle of equity and common sense, be based on their immensely long enjoyment of them, quite apart from the question of their origin. The principle of *prescription*, “the doctrine that there is a limitation of time after which titles, however originated, ought not to be set aside, is to be found,” as Lord Macaulay says, “in all laws, in all countries, and at all times; it is at the very foundation of property.”

APPENDIX E

OUTBREAK OF CONTROVERSY ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST. (See § 79)

“This sacrament—the Eucharist—from the earliest times had withdrawn into the most profound mystery; it had been guarded with the most solemn reverence, shrouded in the most impressive ceremonial. It had become as it were the Holy of Holies of the religion, in which the presence of the Godhead was only the more solemn from the surrounding darkness. That Presence had as yet been unapproached by profane and searching controversy, had been undefined by canon, neither agitated before Council nor determined by Pope. During all these centuries no language had been thought too strong to express the overpowering awe and reverence of the worshippers. . . . Christ’s real Presence was in some indescribable manner in the Eucharist;¹ but

¹ Appendix G, below. See 1 Cor. xi. 24, 29, R.V. “THIS IS MY

under the notion of the real Presence might meet conceptions the most dissimilar, ranging from the most subtle spiritualism to the most gross materialism. . . . Between these two extremes would be the great multitude of believers, who would contemplate the whole subject with remote and reverential awe. To these the attempt at the scrutiny or even the comprehension of the mystery would appear the height of profane presumption ; yet their intuitive apprehension would shrink on the one hand from refining the holy bread and wine into mere symbols, on the other from that transubstantiation which could not but expose the actual Godhead to all the accidents to which those elements, not now merely corporeal and with all the qualities of the human flesh and blood, but actually deified, might be subject."—
DEAN MILMAN, *Latin Christianity*, vol. iii., pp. 446-447.

APPENDIX F

ROMAN CORRUPTIONS OF THE FAITH. (See § 170)

With the learned BINGHAM (Preface to "Christian Antiq." p. xvii.) we may thus summarize the chief Romish errors and superstitions, nearly all of which will be found touched upon in these pages :—(1) Transubstantiation ; (2) idolatry in its various species of worshipping saints, angels, images, relics, the host, and the cross ; (3) the doctrine of deposing Kings ; (4) the Pope's pretence to infallibility and universal power over the Church ; (5) exempting the clergy from the power of the civil magistrate ; (6) the imposition of celibacy upon the clergy ; (7) the Scriptures locked up in an unknown tongue ; (8) Divine service in a language not understood ; (9) the sacrilegious deprivation of one half of the communion ; (10) the absolute necessity of auricular confession imposed ; (11) the use of interdicts and indulgences ; (12) private and solitary masses, and the doctrine of purgatory.

BODY. . . . He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, IF HE DISCERN NOT THE BODY."

APPENDIX G

THE "REAL PRESENCE" NOT TRANSUBSTANTIATION. (See §§ 99, 289)

"To every faithful soul appear,
And show Thy Real Presence here."

WESLEY.¹

"The soul is no more able than the body to live on 'abstract' food. As the latter needs, not a dissertation on bread, but bread itself, so the former needs, not a definition of God, but God Himself."—REV. A. J. HARRISON.

The term "real presence" has been sadly confused in modern times with the term "transubstantiation," and the idea has grown up, especially in the Dissenting world, that to believe in the "sacraments" is somehow "Popish" and "contrary to the Reformation," the fact of course being that the Church of England at the Reformation resolutely held to the sacraments (see the Prayer-Book), and resolutely holds to them still, as an inseparable part of the "Faith once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude, v. 3, R.V.) by the Lord, and handed down from generation to generation by the One Catholic Apostolic Church, His organ upon earth (compare 1 Tim. iii. 15). Accretions on this pure and primitive Faith can be easily detected, and were resolutely removed by us at the Reformation. Among these the doctrine of a "real presence" certainly may not be placed, for we find it alike in the Scriptures and in the early Church, as it came from the hands of the Apostles, its primal rulers. And accordingly the Zwinglian view, which arose in Switzerland in the sixteenth century (p. 217 above) and made the Holy Communion nothing more than a *bare commemoration of our Lord's death*,

¹ "Hymns on the Lord's Supper," by John and Charles Wesley, No. cxvi. This magnificent hymn is printed also in "Hymns Anc. and Mod." No. 556. The book itself, which, so long as Wesley lived, was sold at all the Methodist "Preaching Houses" throughout the country, is reprinted in a cheap form by John Hodges, Bedford Street, Strand, and is of deep interest.

found no favour with the English Reformers, and is decisively repudiated both in the Prayer-Book, the Articles, and the Homilies of our Church.

No one who reads carefully our Lord's own express words, with the inspired Apostolic comment upon them,¹ need hesitate to use the term "real presence," or "real objective presence" as it is sometimes still more clearly expressed, to denote that, *spiritual* though that presence is and not material or carnal, it is *real*—it is *there*—Christ does actually communicate to us at His Table, albeit in a mystery which, like the kindred mystery of the Incarnation,² is beyond our understanding, His own most precious Body and Blood, to be our needful *sustenance*. With our mouth we feed upon the Bread and Wine, and with the mouth of *faith* upon the glorified Body and Blood. For with the whole Christian Church from the beginning we believe that when the elements have been *consecrated*, *i.e.* solemnly set apart for the purpose by an authorized minister of Christ's Church, with thanksgiving and prayer, and in the way in which He Himself set them apart at the first, the bread and the wine so set apart come to us laden with the rich gift of His humanity. They are no longer merely bread and wine; but, remaining in their own nature unchanged *so far as they are themselves*

¹ I Cor. xi. 29 (quoted p. 323 n.). "What is this but an assertion of the Lord's real presence then and there, under the veils of bread and wine? For unless the Body and Blood of the Lord are verily and indeed there present, how could any one be guilty of dishonouring Them? Unless the Body be there, how could any one be blamed for not discerning It?"

² "I have become a partaker of Flesh and Blood for your sakes; again that very Flesh and Blood by which I have become akin to you I give back to you."—S. CHRYSOSTOM, in *Joann. Hom.* xlvi. 3. Christ, as the *Second Adam*, transmits to "them that receive Him" the *new* humanity which, in the mystery of the Incarnation, He has taken into Himself, and *through* which He makes us "partakers of the Divine nature" (2 Pet. i. 4; S. John, vi. 56). This is the unfaltering testimony of the Bible, the primitive Church, and the ancient Fathers everywhere. Nor must it be forgotten that the effect of this reception of Christ's glorified humanity extends to our body as well as soul. See S. John, vi. 54, 57; Iren. iv. 18. 5; Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." v. 56, §§ 9, 10; 67, § 11; and the Prayer of Humble Access in our Communion Service: also "Lux Mundi," x. pp. 426-429; and Freeman, "Princ. of Div. Serv." vol. iii., pp. 426-427.

*concerned,*¹ they by the quickening influence of the Holy Spirit become in a mystery to us who feed upon them His precious Body and Blood—not in any gross carnal sense (S. John, vi. 63), but in the sense in which He so carefully explained beforehand the *necessity* of that partaking of His humanity for the reception of everlasting life (S. John, vi. 52-60).² That that partaking may take place without the sacrament is true, for the sacraments do not (so to speak) tie God's hands;³ but that the Holy Communion is the *appointed*, the *ordinary* means of reception is clear from our Lord's words at the institution, when at the earliest possible moment (compare S. John, vi. 51), when the awful Sacrifice was actually in progress⁴ and in will already consummated,⁵ He, the Victim and the Priest, with a definite reference to the discourse some months before at Capernaum, showed His disciples *how* the "eating and drinking" of which He had then spoken, was to be performed. For any therefore to *expect the necessary grace without using the appointed means* is an act of pure presumption, and an act of faithless disobedience:⁶ their position is entirely different from that of those who, while wishful to use the means, are unable for any good reason to do so,

¹ Compare Iren. iv. 18. 5. This is the crucial point (see p. 158, n. 2) on which the Church of Rome has gone astray by the theory of Transubstantiation, which, at least in its popular presentation, "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament" (Art. xxviii. at end of our Prayer-Book), by *annihilating the reality of the bread and wine*, and thus "hath given occasion to many superstitions." See Archdeacon Wilberforce's "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," pp. 253-4; and on the nature of the change effected, and the undue stress upon it which, beginning in the middle of the fourth century, gave rise to some exaggerated and ill-balanced statements, see the same work, pp. 236-249.

² It is marvellous that anyone who remembers that S. John was writing when the Holy Communion of the Body and the Blood (1 Cor. x. 16) was in full and constant use among his readers, can venture to deny the connection between his sixth chapter and the Holy Communion, as between his third chapter and the other great Sacrament, Holy Baptism. Both references were undoubted in the Church till quite modern times.

³ Wilberforce, *op. cit.*, pp. 171, 172, 216.

⁴ S. Luke, xxii. 19, 20 (Greek). Note the *present* tenses, "is being given . . . is being shed."

⁵ S. John, xvii. 4 (R.V.).

⁶ Compare 2 Kings, v. 10-14. "There was no inherent virtue in the waters of Jordan to heal the leper any more than in the 'rivers of

and whose necessity God will supply, as He can do, *without* the outward means by which it is His good pleasure to ordinarily work.¹

For the reality of the presence as an essential doctrine of our Church, extract after extract can be quoted from our English theologians. But the familiar words of the Catechism will suffice: the “inward part or thing signified”—expressly distinguished from the “benefits” of which we partake thereby—is “the Body and Blood of Christ, which *are verily and indeed taken* and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper.” Here is the real presence: words could not be stronger. They are “taken,” and are therefore *there before* reception.² Christ is there, really present, though only to be really *touched*, as of old, by the hand of humble and earnest (however faltering) faith.³ But “the faith of the communicant has nothing to do with the *fact* of Christ’s presence. Faith creates nothing; its province is to receive some gift already existing independently of it.”⁴

Once more, and this must be very carefully noted, the presence is not in any sense whatever a *local* or *material* one.⁵ It transcends altogether our limits of space and time. Even Rome, in her soberer moments, is constrained to admit this: and the cautious language of her trained

Damascus.’ But God had chosen to energize through the one and not through the other; and that made all the difference.”—CANON MACCOLL, *Lawlessness*, etc., p. 281. See the passages cited above, p. 3, notes 7 and 8: and Hooker, “Ecc. Pol.” v. 50, § 3, 57, § 3; Canon Moberly, “Ministerial Priesthood,” pp. 60-63.

¹ See the Rubric on Spiritual Communion in our service for the Communion of the Sick, and the similar one in the old Sarum manual. Compare S. Thomas Aquinas, “Summa Th.,” Pars Tertia, qu. lxxx., art. I, end.

² On the remarkably careful and accurate way in which the same truth is brought out in the wording of Articles xxviii. and xxix., see Dr. Gibson *in loc.*, and especially his p. 661. We know from Bishop Guest himself that the important words in the Article, “only after a *heavenly and spiritual manner*,” were of his “own penning,” and were not intended to “exclude the Presence of Christ’s Body from the Sacrament, but only the *grossness and sensibleness* in the receiving thereof.”

³ S. Luke, viii. 45; S. John, xx. 17.

⁴ Canon MacColl, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

⁵ *Id. ib.*, pp. 276-282.

theologians is very different from the ordinary rhetoric of her preachers,¹ and the ordinary belief of her followers. The matter is well expressed by Newman when he writes ("Via Media," vol. ii., p. 228 n.): "Our Lord is *in loco* in heaven, not (in the same sense) in the sacrament. . . . But if place is excluded from the idea of the sacramental presence, therefore division or distance from Heaven is excluded also, for distance implies a measurable interval, and such there cannot be except between places. Moreover if the idea of distance is excluded, therefore is the idea of motion. Our Lord then NEITHER DESCENDS FROM HEAVEN UPON OUR ALTARS, NOR MOVES WHEN CARRIED IN PROCESSION. The visible species change their position, but He does not move. He is in the Holy Eucharist *after the manner of a spirit.*"² Contrast this with the "awful and revolting" language forced upon Berengar (above, § 99) at the Council of A.D. 1059, and again, in identical terms, upon Sir John Cheke in Mary's reign, that "the body and blood of Christ are *sensually*, not only in sacrament but in truth (*veritate*), handled and broken by the hands of the priests, and crushed by the teeth of the faithful"!³ As

¹ As an instance (one out of many) of what we mean may be cited some words from a recent Advent pastoral of one of the intruded Romanist Bishops: "In the blessed Sacrament, the great God, the Creator and Lord of all, becomes Emmanuel, God with us. He trusts Himself to us; He is dependent upon us for respect and honour; He appeals to us, *as if He were still in the helplessness of infancy*, for protection and care. *If we do not take care of Him, He is exposed to neglect, to insult, and to sacrilege.* Thus He is the Babe of Bethlehem *still*, and we have to supply as best we can the place of His Blessed Mother and S. Joseph." (The italics are our own.) Such words as these, spoken of our Risen and Ascended Saviour, strongly contrast with the sober and reverent reticence of the Church of England. Compare the treatment of the same thought by S. Chrysostom ("in 1 Cor. Hom." xxiv. p. 218 B), and on the error of confusing the outward form with the inward reality, and supposing that accidents that happen to the one can happen to the other, see Wilberforce, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

² So the Council of Trent (§ 322) is in close agreement with the so-called "black rubric" at the end of our Communion Service, when it admits that "*the Body of Christ cannot be rendered present by change of place, as it would then cease to be in Heaven: for whatever is moved must of necessity cease to occupy the place from which it is moved.*" See further, Wilberforce, *op. cit.*, ch. vi.

³ Freeman, "Princ. of Div. Serv." vol. ii., pp. 64-66.

regards the *manner* of our Saviour's presence the Church of England is content not to know : she devoutly accepts our Lord's words, but declines to speculate upon them. "What these elements are in themselves, it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ, his promise in witness hereof sufficeth, his word he knoweth which way to accomplish ; why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, O my God thou art true, O my soul thou art happy !" ¹

[A word may be added on the controversy as to reception by the wicked. If food is placed within the lips of a dead man, *it does not cease to be food*, yet the dead man cannot be said, in any rational sense of the word, to "eat" it. In the same way the wicked, of whom the Bible speaks as "*dead in trespasses and sins*" ²—since the organ of the spiritual eating, a living faith,³ is entirely lacking to them—cannot be said, in any rational sense of the word, to "eat" that which *is none the less really there* and given to them albeit in vain.⁴ "Although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith⁵) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing." (Art. xxix.).]

¹ Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." v. 67, § 12.

² Eph. ii. 1; 1 Tim. v. 6; Jude, v. 12.

³ S. John, vi. 27, 29, 47, 58. (This last verse is surely decisive of the question.) Compare Wilberforce, pp. 349 ff. and 356-357.

⁴ Similarly S. Chrysostom says ("in Ep. ad Heb. Hom." xvii., p. 169 C.), "As food, which in its nature is nutritive, in one of disordered appetite works mischief and ruin, and becomes a starting-point of disease, *so is it with the fearful Mysteries.*" So our Homily on the Sacrament, pt. i. towards the end. Compare the Prayer of Humble Access in the Communion service, "Grant us *so* to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, *that* our sinful bodies," etc.

⁵ "In Joann." xxvi. § 18. There is so much mental confusion on the whole subject that it may be well to point out to readers of the article that not even the devout communicants "press with their teeth" the *res sacramenti*. It is no carnal or material thing : "Corpus Christi est cibus mentis, non ventris, animae non corporis."—S. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Opusc.* lix. 6.

APPENDIX H

INDULGENCES. (See § 201)

The ancient discipline of *penance* imposed after the confession of open and scandalous sin, as a proof of sincerity of repentance (Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." vi. 3, § 1, 5, § 8), became by degrees softened and transmuted into the performance of a definite act of piety of some kind, such as a pilgrimage, or even a money-contribution to the Church. And an indulgence was originally merely a remission of the *penalty imposed by the Church* for some sin. Even this early stage was by no means harmless—the substitution of some easy duty such as money-giving¹ for real and heart-sorrowing penance became indirectly an incitement to commit the sin again. But when indulgences were actually granted for *future* sins, and also extended to the temporal penalties *inflicted by God* in this world or the next,² the result upon the lives of those who put faith in them was disastrous indeed.

Practically, the earliest example of a "plenary indulgence," i.e. one for all sins without exception or limitation, was the one proclaimed by Pope Urban II. for those who joined the First Crusade (see above, p. 88), and the effect of it upon the lives of the Crusaders was very awful. But the system continued to flourish and develop; and the Schoolmen of the thirteenth century, finding it an established part of the Church system, invented for its justification (see p. 108, n. 2) the startling theory that there exists a Treasury of Supererogation, i.e. of superfluous merits of Christ and of *His Saints*

¹ See a very striking passage from Abelard (A.D. 1079-1142), quoted in the "Student's Ecc. Hist." vol. ii., pp. 284, 285. The abuse grew up about the seventh century, when the tendency was to catalogue sins, in "Penitentials," at so much apiece. For the penitential system and the commutation of penance, Dr. Gibson refers to Strong's "Bampton Lectures," pp. 314, 342.

² The power of indulgences was, and is, expressly held to include Purgatory within its scope.

(contrast our Article xiv.), from which the Pope has power to make grants to individuals at pleasure ! These indulgences, whether granted wholesale on all sorts of religious occasions¹ (in return for contributions), or hawked about retail by the “questuary preachers” or “pardoners” who infested every land, became a source of great revenue and of intolerable scandal in the Middle Ages (p. 163, n. 1) till finally they roused Luther to the task of Reformation (§ 201).

“ Long before Luther, this abuse had rankled in the heart of Christendom. It was in vain for the Church to assert that, rightly understood, indulgences only released from temporal penances . . . The language of the promulgators and vendors of the indulgences, even of the indulgences themselves, was, to the vulgar ear, the broad, plain, direct guarantee from the pains of purgatory, from hell itself, for tens, hundreds, thousands of years ; a sweeping pardon for all sins committed, a sweeping license for sins to be committed. Chaucer’s Pardoner is a striking illustration of the popular notion and popular feeling in England. [For Chaucer, see above, § 167]. The irrefragable testimony to the universal misinterpretation of the language of the indulgences, the misinterpretation riveted on the minds of men by their profligate vendors, is the solemn, reiterated repudiation of those notions by Councils and by Popes. The definitions of the Council of Trent and of Pius V. had not been wanted, if the Church doctrine had been the belief of mankind.”² Even the restrictions and definitions of the Council of Trent, however, cannot save the doctrine from being a “fond” invention³ of the Schoolmen, unknown to the early Church, and perilous in the extreme.

¹ E.g. the dedication of churches, pilgrimages to some specified shrine, or attendance at some particular festival, etc. “ An enormous stimulus was given to the system by the institution of the [Papal] ‘ Jubilee ’ in 1300, when Boniface VIII. [see above, § 150] offered ‘the fullest forgiveness of sins’ (*plenissimam suorum concedimus veniam peccatorum*) to all those who for fifteen days should devoutly visit the churches of S. Peter and S. Paul in Rome. This naturally drew a vast crowd of pilgrims to the city, and greatly enriched the Church.”—DR. GIBSON, *Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 432 (q.v.).

² Dean Milman, “ Latin Christianity,” vol. viii.

³ See Art. xxii. at end of our Prayer-Book.

APPENDIX J

CRANMER'S OATH. (See § 224)

The oath taken by pre-Reformation Bishops to the Pope, on which Romanist controversialists lay much stress, “*was regularly limited*,” Canon Dixon points out,¹ “*by the oath which pre-Reformation Bishops took at the same time to the King*; the first words of which were that they did ‘utterly renounce and clearly forsake all such clauses, words, sentences, and grants which they had or should hereafter have of the Pope’s Holiness that in any wise had been, were, or hereafter might be, hurtful or prejudicial’ to the King, his dignity, or state Royal. The one oath was so qualified by the other as to leave the Royal Supremacy intact.” He adds, “It has been remarked that, in taking it, he [Cranmer] omitted or altered certain clauses. It has not, however, been remarked by any writer that Cranmer did not originate these alterations himself. He simply returned to the oath as it was in [Archbishop] Dene’s time, and his oath at his consecration was word for word the same that Dene took at his [and which is given by Parker, “*De Antiq. Brit.*” 452]. In the interval between them the oath had grown stronger by receiving the additions which Cranmer took away. Among them were the . . . promises to defend and augment the rights, honours, privileges, and authorities of the see of Rome, and to prosecute all heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the Holy Father.

“It is remarkable, further, . . . that all these additions were omitted not only by Cranmer, but by Pole also at his consecration [in the reign of Queen Mary]; and that Pole’s oath and Cranmer’s oath were word for word the same. It may be added as to Pole that he received his temporalities and letters patent containing a clause that he [had] renounced anything prejudicial to the realm in the Papal Bull providing him to Canterbury;² and this clause was inserted after the

¹ In a letter to the “Church Times,” June, 1893.

² “. . . quod idem Electus omnibus et singulis verbis Nobis et

reconciliation of the kingdom in Mary's reign [compare § 301, end], and was used in about a dozen episcopal appointments.

"An oath with such a history shows, what everything else shows, that the national independence of the Church of England was not taken away by the admitted primacy of Rome. The Bishops who took it were not Roman Catholics, but English Catholics in communion with Rome. Our forefathers were always very watchful of the Pope. . . ."

APPENDIX K

THE REIGNS OF EDWARD VI. AND MARY. (See § 275)

It must be carefully remembered, in studying these two brief reigns, that there were two extreme parties at this time, both within the Church. On one side were the ultra-Protestants, who not only sympathized with the Reformers abroad in their opposition to the corruptions of Rome, but wished to follow them in their own errors and excesses, and so to deprive the Church of England of her *Catholicity*. On the other side was the Romanizing faction, which aimed at restoring the Papal power in England, and depriving the Church of her *Nationality*, as had been so often attempted by the Popes in past centuries. Both these extreme parties were *minorities* within the Church;¹ the great mass of the nation, both clergy and laity, belonged to neither, and were only anxious, while repudiating the Papal supremacy, to continue to walk in the ancient Catholic paths (§ 307). Accordingly, we find that when each of these factions had had its turn of power and failed utterly to gain its ends (the Pro-

coronæ nostræ præjudicialibus in dictis litteris Bullatis contentis coram nobis palam et expresse *renunciavit*, et gratiæ nostræ humiliter se submisit. . . ." See Canon Dixon, "Hist. Ch. Eng." vol. iv., pp. 487, 556.

¹ Compare Macaulay's essay on "Lord Burleigh and his Times," where this is well brought out.

testants in the short reign of Edward VI., the Romanizers in the still briefer reign of Mary), the extremists on both sides broke away from the National Church in schism during Elizabeth's reign, the Romanists because the Church of England would not place herself again under the yoke of Papal dominion, the Protestant sects because she would not give up her Catholicity, and adopt, as Scotland had done, foreign ideas and an exotic system of religion.

APPENDIX L

PRAYER FOR THE FAITHFUL DEPARTED.

(See § 248)

The Church has always prayed for her departed members, that they and we alike may be granted the Eternal Rest and the Light Perpetual which shall shine forth on the Resurrection morning.¹ Such a continuance of prayer, following those we have "loved and lost" into the unseen state in which they now exist—a state, as we know, not of final consummation, but of waiting expectancy—is fully consonant both with reason and natural feeling.² It is, above all, a realization of our unbroken Oneness with them in the Body, whose Head is the "Lord both of the dead and living," in Whose sight "all live."³ It is sanctioned by our Lord's attendances at the service of the Jewish synagogues—where such prayers were constantly offered⁴—without one word of

¹ See 2 Esdr. ii, 34, 35, from which the well-known anthem is taken.

² "The son whom you so loved is not really what we call dead, but more actually living than when alive here. You cannot catch the voice, or feel the hands, or kiss the cheek, that is all; a separation for an hour, not an eternal farewell."—LORD TENNYSON (to a friend, Mrs. Elmhirst), *Memoir*, vol. ii., p. 105.

³ S. Luke, xx. 38; Rom. xiv. 9; Eph. iv. 9, 10, 15, 16; Rev. i. 18.

⁴ Compare 2 Macc. xii. 44. This passage "certainly shows the belief of the ancient Jews in the efficacy of prayer for the departed in the first or second century before Christ."—DR. GIBSON, *Thirty-Nine Art.*, p. 549, n. 2.

blame or rebuke, and by the constant practice of the Church in the earliest ages, a practice which must have been based on Apostolic sanction.¹ “In every form, from the solemn Liturgies which embodied the belief of the Church’s profoundest thinkers and truest worshippers, to the simple words of hope and love which were traced over the graves of the poor, her voice went up without a doubt or misgiving, in prayers for the souls of the [faithful] departed.”²

The Romish doctrine concerning *Purgatory* (Art. xxii.) is, like so much else Romish, an outgrowth and a distortion of a true and Catholic practice (compare below, p. 350, n. 7). The idea of a cleansing fire of purgatory after death grew up by little and little,³ and became a source of very grave errors, both in doctrine and practice,⁴ till it was rightly repudiated by us at the Reformation.

“Holy Scripture plainly teaches that at death the disembodied soul passes into the place of departed spirits, where the faithful are at rest and peace in the presence of Christ,⁵ and that their existence there is ‘far better’ than life in the flesh,⁶ and that all, good and wicked alike, must rise hereafter with their bodies to give account for their works.⁷ It is only natural”—since the dead are not yet made per-

¹ Compare the prayer which comes so naturally to the lips of S. Paul, as he thinks of his departed convert Onesiphorus (2 Tim. i. 18).

² Dean Plumptre, “The Spirits in Prison,” p. 25. For the commemoration of the departed at the Holy Eucharist, universal in the Liturgies, compare Heb. xiii. 7, R.V., contrasted with verse 17.

³ The stages are briefly traced by Dr. Gibson, *op. cit.*, pp. 543-548.

⁴ It led the way in particular to the whole system of private masses for the dead, for which large sums of money were left by will, or paid by the friends of the deceased, in order to shorten, as was supposed, the duration of purgatorial pain. Compare above, § 280.

⁵ Rev. xiv. 13; Phil. i. 23. Compare Wisd. iii. 1-3, a passage read by the Church of England as one of her special lessons on All Saints’ Day.

⁶ Phil. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 6-8. Compare the words of the Burial Service: “We give thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world,” and of the Baptismal Service, “that he may so pass the waves of this troublesome world that finally he may come to the land of everlasting life.”

⁷ S. John, v. 28, 29; 2 Cor. v. 10. Note that the works are those “done in the body.” This life, so far as we know, is our only time of probation. “One Life; a little gleam of Time between two Eternities; no second chance for us for evermore!”—CARLYLE.

fect¹—“to believe that in the intermediate state those who died in grace² will be purified and prepared in some way for the enjoyment”—with us hereafter—“of heaven, and all the ancient Liturgies contain prayers for the rest and peace of the holy departed.”³ And therefore at every Christian grave-side we pray that we, with all those that are *departed* in the true faith of God’s holy Name, may have our *perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul*—a bliss not yet attained to (2 Tim. ii. 18)—in His eternal and everlasting glory. And in our Liturgy, following the example of all known Liturgies, we commemorate⁴ before God all His servants *departed* this life in His faith and fear, and plead the precious Death of Christ on behalf of ourselves and *all the whole Church*, that we may obtain remission of sins and *all other benefits of His Passion*—“words as inclusive of *every member*, as the petition is inclusive of every blessing.”⁵

We may add here John Wesley’s beautiful prayer for Saturday evening, the time when we naturally think of the “sabbath rest”⁶ of the holy dead, still members with us in the One Body:—“*O Lord, thou God of the spirits of all flesh, be mindful of Thy faithful from Abel the just even unto this day, and for Thy Son’s sake give to them and us in Thy due time a happy Resurrection, and a glorious rest at Thy right hand for evermore.*”⁷

¹ Phil. i. 6, 10. (Note that S. Paul does not say merely “until the day of your death”). Compare 1 Thess. v. 23; Rev. vi. 9-11; Heb. xi. 40.

² Prayers for the lost, for those who “sin unto death,” could avail nothing, 1 John, v. 16. Yet by the *lost* we must understand those only who have deliberately and consciously turned away from Christ and chosen evil for good, dying “in their sins,” (S. John, viii. 21, 24; iii. 19) and committing the “sin against the Holy Spirit,”—wilful and stubborn rebels, so hardened in evil as to be eternally impenitent. (See S. Mark, iii. 29, 30, R.V.; Heb. vi. 4-6; 1 Thess. v. 19; Rev. xxi. 8.) As to others, while we must forbear to dogmatize about any of the “secret things” of God (Deut. xxix. 29), there are gleams of mercy, such as 1 Pet. iii. 19, 20, iv. 6; Acts, xvii. 30 (where see Alford); S. Luke, xii. 47, 48, etc. Compare below, Appendix N.

³ Dr. Baker, “Historical and Dogmatic Position of the Ch. of Eng.” pp. 123, 124.

⁴ Compare Heb. xiii. 7, R.V., already quoted; a passage to which the ancient Syriac Liturgy refers.

⁵ “John Wesley in company with High Churchmen,” p. 86.

⁶ Heb. iv. 9, R.V. Compare S. John, xix. 42.

⁷ Few are aware of the distance the Wesleyans have drifted from the

APPENDIX M

THE CHRISTIAN "SACRIFICE." (See § 283)

"The Eucharist, according to the universal belief of the ancient Church, is to be regarded as a sacrifice *commemorative*, as the Jewish sacrifices were *anticipatory*, of the death of Christ." It is in no sense a new sacrifice, a fresh offering up of Christ;¹ but it *is* a continual pleading, a solemn and effectual commemoration or memorial before God upon earth, of the one Sacrifice which, having been once for all offered on earth, is now being continually pleaded in Heaven by our great High Priest.² It is to be noted that the Jewish sacrifices themselves, the "blood of bulls and goats," had no power to take away sins (Heb. x. 4), but derived their force and efficacy solely from the Sacrifice on Calvary to which they pointed beforehand. For only *one* true and proper Sacrifice has ever been, or could ever be, offered, that of the "Lamb of God, which *taketh* away the sin of the world" (S. John, i. 29; 1 S. John, ii. 2), and the Jewish sacrifices were, and could only be, *figurative* and *metaphorical*, pictures beforehand of the Death. When this truth is once grasped, the objection to this *metaphorical* use of the word must surely disappear; "the Fathers make no scruple at it; no more need we."³ It comes to us, as a matter of fact, from the earliest primitive times,⁴ taking up

position and principles of their great and saintly founder since the time that, unlike him, they abandoned the Church of England, to our heavy loss, and, no less, to theirs.

¹ The mediæval false conceptions about this are emphatically condemned in Art. xxxi. by the accurate term "sacrifices of masses" (*missarum sacrificia*); see Dr. Gibson, *in loc.*, and compare above, p. 251, n. 2. The attempt to pervert this phrase into a condemnation of the Christian Sacrifice as understood by the Church Universal, has arisen from inexactness of theologic thought.

² Heb. v. 6; vii. 25; ix. 24; compare Rev. v. 6; Lev. xvi. 12, 14. See further below, p. 342.

³ Bishop Andrewes, quoted more fully below, p. 343.

⁴ "The conception of the whole action of the Last Supper as a sacri-

and interpreting the language of Scripture itself.¹ It was on the sacrifice of the “ Lamb slain from the foundation of the world ”² that God looked when the Jews, at His express command, by their authorized representatives poured out before Him the blood of an innocent lamb, and partook of its flesh ; and so it is upon that He looks now when we too, in obedience to our Saviour’s express command, offer by our authorized representatives³ the broken bread, and poured

ficial action is found clearly in the Didache (c. xiv.) ; in Ignatius ; and before all in Justin (Apol. i. 65 f.). But Clement of Rome also expresses it when he (chs. 40 to 44) draws a parallel between the bishops and deacons and the Old Testament priests and Levites, and indicates the *προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα* [‘ offering the Gifts ’] as their special function.”—PROFESSOR HARNACK (quoted by Canon Gore). This important statement might have been made still stronger. S. Clement, be it remembered, wrote in the lifetime of an Apostle, and in the first passage referred to (ch. 40) he mentions the performing of “ offerings and liturgies ” in an orderly and definite manner as expressly instituted by our Lord. S. Ignatius again (who was martyred about A.D. 107) speaks repeatedly of the Christian ALTAR as a matter of course (Eph. v., Magn. vii., Philad. iv.), and identifies “ the Eucharist ” with the “ flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father in his goodness raised ” to life again (Smyrn. vi.). The very early writer, Justin Martyr—to say nothing of Irenæus and others that followed (all with the same testimony)—points, like the still earlier writer of the Didache (1st century?) to the famous prophecy of Mal. i. 11 as fulfilled in the Christian SACRIFICE (c. Tryph. 41 and 117). It would be a very serious thing to throw aside as valueless the unanimous testimony of the primitive Church on a point like this, on which it must have had Apostolic guidance. All that is required is to guard carefully against the perversions of it which developed in later times ; and this has been done in our Prayer-Book. Compare p. 350, n. 7, and see Wilberforce, “ Doctr. of Holy Euch.” pp. 318 ff., Dean Spence, “ Ch. of Eng.” vol. ii., p. 224.

¹ Heb. xiii. 10 ; S. Matt. v. 23, 24 ; Mal. i. 11, 12 ; 1 Cor. x. 15-22. “ The Apostle [1 Cor. x. 20, 21] compareth this of ours to the *immolata* of the heathen, and to the Hebrews [Heb. xiii. 10] *habemus aram* matcheth it with the sacrifice of the Jews. And we know the rule of comparisons, they must be *eiusdem generis*.”—BISHOP ANDREWES.

² Rev. xiii. 8. With God there is no past or future, but all is one eternal *Now*. Before it actually happened, it was already fulfilled in the “ determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God ” (Acts, ii. 23). Compare Rev. xvii. 8 ; 1 Pet. i. 20 ; Rom. iv. 17.

³ Our Dissenting friends, who so vehemently reproach us with “ sacerdotalism ” (a very useful word, because of its *ambiguity*, when anyone wants to rouse prejudice against the Church) must first in fairness define what they mean by “ sacerdotalism.” If they say there is now

out wine as a Remembrance or Memorial, and partake thereof. The momentous difference, so far as we are concerned, is that we no longer offer and partake of a *mere* memorial as did the Jews, a *shadow*¹ of the coming reality, but the Thing itself, the *living*² Flesh of the "Lamb as it had been slain" (Rev. v. 6), Who is now "*alive* for evermore" (Rev. i. 18). [See Appendix G.] It is this profound truth³ which invests the Christian "Sacrifice" with such sacred-

no priesthood but that of Christ, we say on the other hand that *every* Christian is a priest (1 Pet. ii. 5, 9; Rev. i. 6, v. 10, xx. 6), as was every Jew (Ex. xix. 6), and in this sense we are no doubt "*steeped in sacerdotalism*," but *so is the Bible*, whose statements we faithfully accept.

If they say the priesthood is now metaphorical only, we heartily agree: but so it was in the Jewish times (p. 338). There was, and is, but one true Priest and one true Sacrifice for sins for ever.

If they say that the congregation needs no representative to offer up its praises and thanksgivings, its prayers and alms, to God, and to distribute authoritatively to it the blessings which God has to bestow, we demur, and say that the whole of the New Testament, as well as their own practice in "*ordaining*" ministers for themselves, is against them. (On the position of Dissenting ministers, see pp. 7, n. 4, 313 n.)

The fact is that, as Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out ("Essay on Chr. Min.", towards the end), *there is a true*, as well as a false, *Sacerdotalism*. The Christian priest stands between men and God not in a *vicarious*, but a *representative*, character. He is, on the one hand, God's ambassador, and charged with the ministry of reconciliation (2 Cor. v. 18-20); and, on the other hand, the congregation's representative before God, offering up before Him its alms and prayers and thanksgivings (see §§ 4, 5, and notes). This is why the so-called "*Eastward position*" is adopted by us, to mark that the priest does not pray his prayers *at* his people for their edification, but stands before them, speaking, as their representative, to *God*. There is all the difference in the world between the two things.

¹ "Wherein would this service have been superior to the Jewish meat-offerings [meal-offerings, R.V.], unless it had been the reality, of which the ancient sacrifices were a typical representation?"—WILBERFORCE, *op. cit.*, p. 306. Compare Heb. x. 1.

² Hence we drink of the Cup, the "*communion of the Blood of Christ*" (1 Cor. x. 16), while the drinking of the blood was forbidden to the Jews, "*for the blood is the life*" (Deut. xii. 23, 27). Compare S. John, vi. 53-57, and above, § 184.

³ In connection with this momentous subject (almost too holy for treatment at all in a book like this) it must ever be remembered that the Church which offers (and we in her) is already *in vital connection and union* with the Son of God, her Head, in a deep reality of which the earthly marriage-tie is the Divinely-indicated sacramental type (Eph.

ness, and makes It, in the language of the ancient Liturgies and Fathers, awful, august, and terrible.¹

At that final Passover Supper with the disciples (S. Luke, xxii. 15), the old Jewish Feast was superseded, and the new Christian Feast (1 Cor. v. 7, 8) expressly instituted, by the Lord Himself, in its place. For, taking into His "blessed and lifegiving hands"² the bread and breaking it, He said not only "Take, eat, this is my Body which is being given for you," words on the meaning of which, as always understood by the Universal Church from earliest days, we have dwelt in Appendix G; but He added "Do THIS," or, more exactly, "Offer this," "UNTO MY MEMORIAL."³ These words, coming as they do in a strictly sacrificial context,⁴ must be intended to have their regular sacrificial meaning, the meaning that they bear in the Greek Version, then in use, of the Old Testament, the Septuagint.⁵

Thus the highest act of Christian worship, instituted by our dying Lord, is no mere shallow *outward* observance, as

v. 29-32, especially v. 30, A.V., compared with Gen. ii. 23, 24, S. Matt. xix. 6.)

¹ Wilberforce, *op. cit.*, p. 331.

² Coptic Liturgy of S. Basil, quoted by Archdeacon Freeman.

³ τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. (1) The verb *ποιεῖν* in the sense "to offer" is very common in the Septuagint, e.g. Ex. xxix. 36-41; Lev. ix. 7-22 (where it occurs nine times), xiv. 19; Num. xxviii. 4, 8; 2 Kings, x. 21 (compare Josephus, B. J. ii. 15. 3); and the early Christian writer Justin Martyr (c. Tryph. 41 and 70) expressly so interprets the words of Institution. (2) The word ἀνάμνησις, "remembrance," "memorial," *always* denotes, where it occurs elsewhere in the Bible (Lev. xxiv. 7; Num. x. 10; Heb. x. 3), a solemn remembrance before God, a sacrificial memorial. "Justin Martyr uses the word several times in this sense, and so does S. Augustine, c. Faust. xx. 18, and Chrysostom, Hom. 25 in Matt. vii.; Eusebius very frequently." (3) The word ἐκχυνόμενον, "which is being poured out" (S. Matt. xxvi. 28; S. Mark, xiv. 24; S. Luke, xxii. 20) from the obvious reference to the words of Moses in Ex. xxiv. 8 seems to express, as Canon Gore remarks, not the mere shedding of the blood in death, but the *sacrificial* pouring out of it (Ex. xxiv. 12; Lev. iv. 7, 19, 25, 30, 34, viii. 15, ix. 9, etc. Sept.). (4) For the word "given" as a *sacrificial* term, see Lev. vii. 13, 15; and compare Mic. vi. 7; Gal. i. 4; Eph. v. 2; Tit. ii. 13, 14; S. John, vi. 51. See Archdeacon Freeman, "Princ. of Div. Serv." vol. ii., pp. 87 end, 242.

⁴ Archdeacon Freeman, *I.c.*, pp. 3, 4, 7.

⁵ See above, n. 3.

the Zwinglian view, which arose in the sixteenth century,¹ would have it to be; but is pregnant with deep and vital reality. Like the old Jewish sacrifices, it has a twofold aspect—towards God, and towards ourselves. Towards God, it is the pleading and showing forth² on earth of the Sacrifice of the Lord's most precious Death, essentially identical with the unceasing Offering by our Saviour of Himself in heaven, as a “Priest *for ever*,” “who *ever* liveth to make intercession for us.”³ We offer through Christ—worthy to do so solely *in Him*⁴—a threefold sacrifice, as is so admirably brought out in our Prayer of Oblation⁵—first, the sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving, corresponding to the Jewish peace-offering (Lev. iii., vii. 11-17)⁶ with its privilege of *communion*; secondly, that of our own selves (Rom. xii. 1) surrendered to God to be His and His alone, corresponding to the burnt-offering (Lev. i. 3 ff.) in which the whole of the Sacrifice was burnt on the Altar to represent the entire devotion of the sacrificer to God; and thirdly, the commemorative offering and pleading of CHRIST'S DEATH, on which the other two *entirely* depend for acceptance, represented in Bread broken and Wine poured out, and by its

¹ Above, p. 217. Compare Archdeacon Freeman, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., Introd., p. 201.

² 1 Cor. xi. 26. Compare Num. x. 10.

³ See Heb. vi. 20, vii. 24, 25; Rev. v. 6; Rom. viii. 34. The last of the “Comfortable Words” in our Communion Service is meant to remind us of this. These three “Words” declare to us first the Divine LOVE, in our Saviour's own words (S. Matt. xi. 28; S. John, iii. 16); then the ATONEMENT (1 Tim. i. 15; note the *past* tense “came,” and compare S. John, xix. 30; Heb. ix. 25, 26; and then the perpetual INTERCESSION (1 S. John, ii. 1; note the *present* tenses “have” and “is”). Such is the wonderful skill with which these “Comfortable Words” are chosen, to *lead* us to “lift up our hearts” unto the Lord!

⁴ This is vividly and beautifully brought out by the Prayer of Oblation in its present position, *after* Reception. Compare Archdeacon Freeman, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 435, 436. See Eph. v. 30, 1 Pet. ii. 5, etc. In other Liturgies the Prayer of Oblation comes before Reception. Compare § 289.

⁵ See these three aspects similarly brought out in Heb. xiii.—the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, v. 15; that of self-devotion, v. 16; and that of our Lord, on which both depend, v. 10.

⁶ See Archdeacon Freeman, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 264, ff., 271 end-276.

mystical identification with the “One Only Sacrifice which can for sin atone,” corresponding to the Jewish sin-offering (Lev. iv.-vi.).¹ Verily, in coming to this service, we must “lift up our hearts”² to the “heavenly places” (Eph. i. 3, ii. 6). Heaven is opened, and earth melts from our view, as “with ANGELS and ARCHANGELS, and with all the Company of heaven,³ we laud and magnify” our God, and join in the Angelic Chant of praise ! (Is. vi. 3.)

Towards ourselves again, the Holy Communion is the perpetual reminder⁴ and showing forth of the Lord’s most precious Death, a realization of His presence (see Appendix G), and an opportunity of the highest adoration and praise. But it is more. He does not send us “empty away”; we draw near and Feast upon that one Sacrifice, and with faithful hearts partake, in a mystery, of the very Body and Blood of the “Victim Divine”⁵ (see Appendix G).

We add two instructive extracts on this important subject, and one which is of wider application.

(a.) “This is it in the Eucharist that answereth to the sacrifice in the Passover, the memorial to the figure. To them it was *hoc facite in Mei præfigurationem*, do this in prefiguration of Me; to us it is ‘Do this in commemoration of Me.’ . . . By the same rules that theirs was, by the same may ours be termed a sacrifice. In rigour of speech, neither of them: for to speak after the exact manner of divinity, there is but one only sacrifice, *veri nominis*, properly so called; that is, Christ’s death. While yet this offering was not, the hope of it was kept alive by the prefiguration of it in theirs.

¹ *Ib.*, pp. 249, 250.

² The “*Sursum corda*,” or cry to the people to “lift up” their “hearts,” is found in verbal identity in all the ancient Liturgies throughout the world, and so is the Angelic Hymn (Is. vi. 3; Rev. iv. 8).

³ See the grand passages, Rev. vii. 9-17; Heb. xii. 22-24; Col. i. 16-18; Eph. i. 10, 21; and compare the express mention in the Creed of the “Communion of Saints.”

⁴ Μεμνημένοι οὖν ὅν δι’ ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινεν (“Mindful therefore of what for our sakes He endured”) is the phrase of the Liturgies.

⁵ This hymn of Wesley (“Hymns Anc. and Mod.” No. 556), which gives magnificent expression to the Church’s doctrine, has been already referred to, p. 325 n.

And after it is past, the memory of it is still kept fresh in the mind by the commemoration of it in ours. So it was the will of God that so there might be with them a continual foreshadowing, and with us a continual showing forth the Lord's death till He come again. Hence it is that what names theirs carried, ours do the like, and the Fathers make no scruple at it; no more need we."—BISHOP ANDREWES, A.D. 1612 (quoted by Prof. Gardiner, *Charles I.*, vol. i., p. 30 n.).

(b.) "That which is offered and consecrated by the priest can be called a sacrifice and an oblation, because it is the memory and representation of the true sacrifice and the holy immolation made on the altar of the Cross. And Christ died once on the Cross and was there immolated in himself; but day by day he is immolated in the sacrament because in the sacrament a remembrance is made of that which was done once."—PETER LOMBARD [see above, § 129] Sentent. iv. Dist. xii. § 7 (quoted by the Rev. F. E. Brightman).¹

(c.) "No small part of the dislike to Ritualism is based on an imperfect grasp of God's Omnipresence. His Person is not believed to be present among us, but only His graces and influences. His Person is supposed to be in some distant region far beyond the skies, and the natural consequence of such a view is a very faint conception of what divine worship means. . . . The material world and the spiritual are not divided from each other by inconceivable distances of space, but by states of existence. . . . 'Heaven lies about us' as the sights and sounds of this fair earth lie about a man born deaf and dumb, and it probably requires nothing more than the opening out of undeveloped senses within us to reveal to us the wonders of the new creation [compare Heb. xii. 22]. . . .

"Of course God is not *more* present at the east end of the church than at the west, for He cannot be localized or confined in space. But it is impossible to realize His presence at all unless we think of Him as localized. . . .

¹ So S. Thomas Aquinas, "Celebratio hujus sacramenti . . . *imago quædam est representativa passionis Christi quæ est vera ejus immolatio*" (*Summ. Th.*, Pars Tertia, qu. lxxxiii., art. 1).

General statements about God's omnipresence leave no definite impression on the mind. And so God Himself condescends to our infirmities, and encourages us to think of Him as 'placing His name' or His 'presence' in certain localities. . . . Those who believe that God is actually in the midst of them will necessarily demean themselves differently from those who think that He is far away."—CANON MACCOLL, *Lawlessness, Sacerdotalism, and Ritualism*, pp. 421-423 (see the whole book, which has been frequently cited in these pages).

APPENDIX N

THE ATHANASIAN CREED. (See p. 247, n. 1)

The English version of this grand Latin doctrinal formulæry is unhappily marred in the Prayer-Book by some misrenderings in its minatory clauses—the Church's "calm-breathed warning of the kindest love"¹—which have led to a complete misunderstanding of its scope and object, and therefore a widespread distaste to its use. Till the Prayer-Book receives the loving and careful revision which it certainly in places needs,² it is necessary to point carefully out two things :

i. These clauses *do not apply to the heathen*, or to those who for any reason (except moral obliquity) have been intellectually unable to grasp the Christian Revelation. This is clear from the words "hold fast" (*teneat*), v. 1, "kept" (*servaverit*), v. 2, "faithfully," vv. 29 and 42. We cannot "hold fast" or "maintain" that which we have never

¹ Compare Keble's exquisite "Lyra Innocentium," ii. 15.

² For instance, the most valuable Longer Exhortation in the Communion Service is spoiled and the sense altogether perverted by the use of the word "damnation," which—though simply old English for "condemnation"—is now so indissolubly connected in men's minds with hell-fire that it conveys to modern ears precisely the opposite sense to that intended by S. Paul (see 1 Cor. xi. 29-32, R.V.). Hence the Exhortation is often now omitted altogether, and so too the Athanasian Creed, to the very great spiritual loss of our people.

received. The fate of the heathen world, and of all non-Christians, is in the hands of “the Judge of all the earth,” who “shall,” we know, “do right” (Gen. xviii. 25): the “Quicunque” is not concerned at all with them, but with Christians alone.

ii. These so-called “damnatory clauses” are the Church’s solemn warning to her children of the danger of APOSTASY; of falling away from the Faith received. In countless cases men *do* not believe because they *will* not believe—because belief would mean giving up a life of sin; the obstacle, however they may blind themselves,¹ is not *really* an intellectual one, but a moral one.² This wilful closing of the eyes and hardening of the heart is condemned in the most stern and uncompromising words in Holy Scripture, and of these the “Creed of S. Athanasius”³ is but the faithful *echo*.⁴ To maintain the Faith once for all delivered to us (Jude, v. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 7), to worship the One God as revealed to us in the ever-blessed Son and Spirit (S. Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 14), and in that Faith to go forth and do the right (see the concluding words)—these are the essentials laid down for us in this great Christian formulary, which should ever be repeated with holy joy, as we think of the myriads who have already suffered and died for this Faith, the glorious Revelation of the Unseen God, which we in our turn are called to defend and hand on “whole and inviolate” to the generations yet unborn.⁵ The case of *others* it is not for us to decide: they are in the hands of the All-Wise and All-Loving, and on them we pronounce no judgment at all.⁶ But to ourselves the “Quicunque” is intended to bring home emphatically the paramount necessity of our (1)

¹ Jer. xvii. 9. It is a memorable truth that doubts and difficulties on religious matters “are not seldom the indication of the presence of some secret sin.”

² See S. John, iii. 18-21, where our Lord Himself points this out.

³ On the date and authorship see p. 19, n. 3.

⁴ See especially S. John, viii. 24, xvii. 3; S. Mark, iii. 29, xvi. 16; Rom. i. 28—ii. 9; Heb. iii. 12-19, vi. 4-8, x. 26-31; 2 Pet. ii. 22. Compare Art. viii. at end of our Prayer-Book.

⁵ Ps. lxxviii. 5-7.

⁶ “Moreover, the Church doth not herein pronounce judgment on any particular person or persons, God alone being the Judge of all.” Declaration by the Convocation of Canterbury, A.D. 1879.

having a definite faith, (2) maintaining it resolutely, and (3) acting upon it in our lives, while (4) it provides an antidote of extreme value against heresies past and present (above, § 15) which make its public recital in the Church a matter of extreme importance. (See Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." v. 42, § 13.)

We append a literal translation, from the original Latin, of such parts only of the Creed¹ as require revision, adding footnotes to explain and bring out the real meaning. Pointing is added, as it is essentially a Psalm, and designed for antiphonal recitation.

QUICUNQUE VULT.

1. "Whosoever would bē in | sáfety :² before all else³ there is need⁴ that he hold fást⁵ the | Cátholic Faith.

2. "Which Faith except each⁶ shall have kept⁷ whóle and in | víolate :⁸ without doubt he will⁹ eternally | pérish.

3. "And the Catholic Faith is | this : That we WORSHIP¹⁰ one God in Trinity, and Trinity in | Unity.

¹ The Creed itself is admirably clear and exhaustive, and is a mine of interest to any who know Church history, for every clause is the record of a battlefield. Compare above, § 54.

² Or, "to be in the way of salvation." It is difficult to find an exact English equivalent for "salvus": it denotes soundness and health—freedom from the spiritual diseases of heresy, which, if unchecked, lead, like all diseases, to death—and involves also the secondary sense of safety in the Day of Judgment (v. 42).

³ *Ante omnia.* Often misunderstood: it denotes not *comparison*, but order of *time*, teaching that right faith must *precede* the right practice which is duly emphasized in v. 41. *Creedless* morality is like a flower without root, which cannot last. Compare Jude, v. 20.

⁴ *Opus est*: not so strong as "it is necessary," the phrase of v. 29.

⁵ *Teneat . . . servaverit.* Thus the Creed is addressed to *Christians* only. See above.

⁶ Each *individually*: Ps. xl ix. 7. Hence "I believe . . ." (Apostles' Creed).

⁷ *I.e.* shall be found in the Day of Judgment to have kept. Compare v. 42 n. On "keeping" the Faith, see Jude, v. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 7.

⁸ *I.e.* maintained in its integrity and purity, without mutilation and without unauthorized addition. See Gal. i. 8; Tit. i. 9, etc.

⁹ Not "shall." It is not a threat; but the statement of a very solemn fact. The emphasis is on "perish." See 2 Thess. i. 9; S. John, xi. 26; Rev. xx. 6.

¹⁰ Note this word. It is not intellectual comprehension that is de-

* * * * *

25. "And in this Trinity there is no afore or | áfter : there is no greater | ór less.¹

* * * * *

28. "He therefore that would bé in | sáfety :² let him thus think³ of the | Tríinity.

29. "But it is necessary⁴ for⁵ eternal sal | vation: that the INCARNATION also of our Lord Jesus Christ he faithful | ly believe.⁶

30. "The right faith therefore is that we believe and cón | fess :⁷ that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God | ánd Man.

* * * * *

41. "And they that have done good shall go into life e | térnal : but they that have done evil into | fire eternal.⁸

42. "This is the Catholic | Faith: which except each shall have faithfully and firmly believed,⁹ he will not be able to bé in | sáfety.¹⁰

siderated, but heart-adoration and love ; not "believe a set of dogmas about" (that in *itself* is useless, S. Jaimes, ii. 19), but "*worship*." So again in v. 27.

¹ This verse "deprecates the application of terms 'greater or less,' 'before or after,' which belong to finite being, to the Divine Personality" (Bishop Barry). The first phrase refers to *duration*, the second to *dignity*.

² *Qui vult ergo salvus esse.* On "salvus," see above.

³ *Ita . . . sentiat:* not "*must* thus think."

⁴ *Sed necessarium est.* What Christian can deny this *necessity* of belief in the Incarnation ? (S. John, xvii. 3). Compare Art. xviii. at end of the Prayer-Book.

⁵ *Ad, i.e.* with a view to.

⁶ *Fideliter credat.* The "*rightly believe*" of E.V. completely misses the sense, and sets the reader on a wrong track. Here again it is not intellectual but *moral* error which is denounced.

⁷ See Rom. x. 9, 10.

⁸ *Vitam æternam . . . ignem æternum* (compare S. Matt. xxv. 46, R.V.). This important verse gives the key to the whole Creed. See comment above. For the fact see S. Matt. xiii. 41, 42, 50, xxv. 31-46; S. Mark, ix. 43-48; Rev. xx. 12-15.

⁹ *Fideliter firmiterque crediderit.*

¹⁰ *Salvus esse non poterit,* "will not be able," viz., at the Day of Judgment. Again the statement of a future *fact*: compare p. 347, n. 9.

APPENDIX O

CONFESsION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
(See § 284)

Confession to God is, as all admit, absolutely essential for the forgiveness of our sins (1 S. John, i. 9; Ps. xxxii. 5; Prov. xxviii. 13).¹ And, therefore, both in the daily services and that of the Holy Communion, the Church puts into the mouth of her children a *General Confession*, which each has to make *special* in his own case, and then directs the priest authoritatively to declare, by the "power" given to him by God, the forgiveness of all sins thus truly and faithfully repented of.²

But there are only too many who repeat with their lips the words of this General Confession, making no *real* confession whatever to God of their own special sins and shortcomings; they feel no genuine sorrow or compunction for them, and, therefore, have *no share* in the Absolution solemnly tendered by God's "ambassador" (2 Cor. v. 19, 20) to His kneeling people. Sins are, very much more frequently than is at all realized, left to rankle and fester in the heart, taking stronger and stronger hold there in consequence of the neglect of the sinning Christian. For the healing of such festering sores something further is required; and it is carefully provided by the Church of England, in the following express directions:

¹ Even from our fellow-men we may not claim forgiveness until we feel, and express to them, contrition for our fault (S. Luke, xvii. 3, 4, "*if he repent*"), although they on their part are then bound to instant and free forgiveness (S. Matt. xviii. 33-35; compare S. Luke, xv. 18-20). How often is this *condition* of forgiveness forgotten or ignored by the wrongdoer, both in the case of God and of man, because admission of his fault implies *humiliation* before the one he has wronged; and thus he goes down to the grave unrepentant and unforgiven!

² Freeman, "Princ. of Div. Serv." vol. ii., pp. 259, 262; and compare above, p. 245.

i. "If there be any of you, who by this means¹ cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word² he may receive the benefit of ABSOLUTION,³ together with ghostly [i.e. spiritual] counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."⁴—*Exhortation in the Communion Service.*

ii. "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special Confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which Confession, the Priest shall ABSOLVE him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort." [A form of Absolution is then given.]⁵—*The Order for the Visitation of the Sick.*

iii. "If any man confess his secret and hidden sins to the Minister, for the unburdening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him; we . . . do straitly charge and admonish him, that he do not at any time reveal and make known to any person whatsoever any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secrecy (except they be such crimes as by the laws of this realm his own life may be called into question for concealing the same), under pain of irregularity."⁶—*Canon 113*, of A.D. 1604.

PRIVATE Confession is thus an integral and indispensable part of the Church system.⁷ The mediæval idea which

¹ Viz., detailed self-examination before the Holy Communion, with contrition, confession to God, and full purpose of amendment.

² See 2 Cor. v. 18-21.

³ S. John, xx. 23. See the Ordering of Priests in our Prayer-Book.

⁴ "If peace with God do not follow the pains we have taken in seeking after it, if we continue disquieted and not delivered from anguish, mistrusting whether that we do be sufficient; it argueth that our sore doth exceed the power of our own skill, and that the wisdom of the pastor must bind up those parts, which being bruised are not able to be recured of themselves."—HOOKER, *Ecc. Pol.*, bk. vi., ch. iv. end.

⁵ Compare Walton's "Life of Hooker," near the end.

⁶ "The 'pain of irregularity' is the heaviest punishment of an ecclesiastical offence that can be inflicted—involving a deprivation of any present office, and rendering a person incapable of holding any thereafter."—WESLEY in *Company with High Churchmen*, p. 46.

⁷ "It is one of the mischiefs which Rome has entailed upon the

made it *compulsory* on all Christians was repudiated by us at the Reformation (see § 284), as unprimitive, and the source of grave abuses. But “not a word was said by authority against voluntary Confession, or against the absolving power of the ministry. There is no Church which uses such forcible and direct language upon this point as the Reformed Church of England. Her chief Reformers spoke with no uncertain tones about it. Latimer urged it under Edward VI. Cranmer made his confession on the morning of his martyrdom ; and when he was reproached with it [by one of the friars after the scene at S. Mary’s], on his way to the stake, he simply answered, ‘*And is not confession a good thing?*’ But it was a great departure from the practice of the Primitive Church to lay it down, as Innocent III. had done [see above, § 133], that every one must needs go to confession in order to remain in the communion of the Church ; and at the Reformation the Catholic liberty in this matter was reasserted. Men in special circumstances were to be moved to make special confession of their sins ; but for the faithful in general, as in the earliest days, it was no longer to be considered a necessity.”¹

It is intended, then—and this must be carefully noted—to be an exceptional remedy for an exceptional state of things in one’s spiritual condition. The analogy of the physical part of our nature will help us here. When in health, we are able to throw off trifling and everyday ailments ; and so, as S. Augustine says, for the daily and light sins without which our life is not led (1 S. John, i. 8), the *daily prayer* suffices to make satisfaction.² But when anything is *seriously wrong*, we at once consult a doctor : to him we reveal of necessity the whole extent of the malady, how-

whole Western Church, even upon those portions of it now delivered from her yoke, that she has rendered suspicious so much which, but for her, none could have thought other than profitable and edifying.”—ARCHBISHOP TRENCH, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, Preface, p. vii. This general principle finds a particular application here.

¹ Professor Mason. On the whole subject see Hooker “Ecc. Pol.” bk. vi. The mediæval and present Romish view was first systematized by S. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century : “Summa Th.,” Pars Tertia, qu. vi.

² De Symb. 14, Serm. xvii. 5.

ever painful and revolting the details may happen to be, and *then* he prescribes the remedy by which, not he himself, but Nature, or, to speak more correctly, God¹ gives the healing. We may keep aloof from the doctor if we like, and say nothing about our malady; but the result will in all probability be the spread of the mischief, and a speedy death. Yet the physician cannot himself heal: he cannot act independently of God: he acts as God's minister, the dispenser of God's remedies to the ailing *body*.

And what is true of the needs of the body is just as true of the needs of the soul. There are cases of spiritual maladies, of "wounds and bruises and putrifying sores" (Is. i. 6), which have resulted from the commission of wilful sin,² and in which the aid of God's minister is all but essential to spiritual recovery: and a full confession is as necessary in the one case as in the other, that a proper remedy may be applied (Ezek. xxxiv. 4; Jer. vi. 14, viii. 11), and in due time the comforting message of God's pardon and absolution authoritatively pronounced (S. John, xx. 23). It is no doubt a painful task, as painful to the confessor as to the penitent himself: but it is efficacious in a way undreamed of by those who, not knowing what it is to feel the burden of sin, rail at confession as Popish,³ "understanding neither what they say nor whereof they confidently affirm." (1 Tim. i. 7, R.V.)⁴

¹

"Nature is but a name for an effect
Whose cause is God."

COWPER.

² It must be remembered in this connection that "the confessions of the holiest are ever the most bitter in their self-accusation, because saints have learned to judge of their sins, not by man's standard, but by Christ's." Their conscience is tender, even as the conscience of a little child is tender; and desire for confession is far from implying gravity of sin.

³ "Satan can use even the names of Popery and Antichrist to bring a truth into suspicion and discredit."—RICHARD BAXTER.

⁴ We may add, knowing by experience their sad truth, the following words of Canon MacColl, which those only will scoff at, who are ignorant of the reality of the mischief: "We are apt to give the youth, of both sexes, credit for more innocence than many of them are entitled to. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil is as alluring now as it was of old, and young minds often pluck the forbidden fruit, and have their minds

[For Biblical instances of confession to God's accredited messenger, see Ex. x. 16, 17; Lev. v. 5; Num. v. 6, 7 (on this see Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." vi. 4, § 4); Josh. vii. 19; 1 Sam. xv. 24, 25; 2 Sam. xii. 13, 14; S. Matt. iii. 6; S. Luke, iii. 3, 8; S. John, xx. 23; Acts, xix. 18. For the testimonies of Luther and Calvin; Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley; Jewell and Hooker and George Herbert; Reynolds and Owen; Richard Baxter and Cecil; Bishop Ken and Bishop Wilson; and John Wesley himself—see "Wesley in company with High Churchmen," pp. 33, and 35-38. On the whole subject see Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." bk. vi. (esp. ch. iv. § 7); Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of London; and Canon MacColl's "Lawlessness," etc., pp. 394, ff.]

APPENDIX P

THE KALENDAR OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. (See § 317.)

"The life and the death of saints is precious in God's sight."
HOOKER.

Besides the greater Festivals of the Christian Year,¹ the "Red Letter" days, which are marked in the Prayer-Book by special Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, special Lessons, and the observance of *Vigils*,² our Prayer Book Kalendar,

'opened' to an extent which would astonish parents and teachers if they knew it. If the hidden life of our public, and still more of our private schools, whether for boys or girls, could be written, it would throw a lurid light on the records of many a crime and premature death. I am persuaded that if the dispassionate opinion of medical men could be got, they would say that their art, sometimes unavailing, would in many cases have been unnecessary if some of their patients had 'opened their grief' to some 'discreet and learned minister of God's word.' . . . Many a moral sore goes on festering unto death because there is no skilful hand to probe the wound."—*Lawlessness*, etc., p. 394.

¹ These are Festivals of our LORD, of His Mother, and of the Apostles and Evangelists; also of the Holy Innocents, S. John Baptist, S. Stephen, All Saints, and All Angels. Compare Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." v. 70, § 8.

² Vigils are times of preparation beforehand for a Festival (the day

drawn up by a commission under Queen Elizabeth, contains numerous minor Festivals, the “Black Letter” days, designed to put continually before us for thanksgiving, and for our holy emulation, the saintly life of all ages and all lands, in which Christ has been continually manifested and glorified by His saints. The neglect into which these saints’ days have largely fallen is quite contrary to the intention of the Church (compare § 317): they can at least be commemorated by the use of the All Saints’ Collect, or a special hymn,¹ and wonderfully help us to realize the “Communion of Saints.” A complete list of the minor Festivals selected for observance by our Church is given below, with the names arranged in chronological order, and the date of the festival day subjoined. A necessarily brief account of each is added.

i. *Saints of the first Three Centuries.* (Compare § 10)

- S. MARY MAGDALENE (July 22). See S. Luke, viii. 1-3 ;
S. Matt. xxvii. 55, 56 ; S. John, xx. 1-18. (Wrongly identified with the penitent in S. Luke, vii. 37 ff.)
- S. NICOMEDE, Martyr (June 1). Beaten to death, A.D. 85, in the persecution of Domitian.
- S. CLEMENT, Bishop (Nov. 23). Phil. iv. 3 : Bishop of Rome at end of the first century, and writer of a still existing Epistle to the Corinthians.
- S. PERPETUA, Martyr (March 7). A noble lady of Carthage, thrown to wild beasts in A.D. 203.²

before, unless it be a Sunday) by prayer and fasting. The Festivals of S. Luke, of S. Michael and All Angels, and those that occur in the Christmas or Easter or Whitsunday season, have no Vigils; and a Vigil which would fall on a Sunday is kept on the Saturday, Sunday never being a fast-day, even in Lent. On fasting, see below, Appendix Q.

¹ “In no point is our national hymnody weaker than in historical hymns, hymns which connect the present age of the English Church with the old heroes of the faith, whose names are preserved, apparently only to be ignored, in our Calendar.”—*Life of Canon Ellerton*, p. 139.

² The famous “Acts” of S. Perpetua and her fellow-martyrs, Felicitas and Saturninus, written partly by themselves, are still extant.

- S. CECILIA, Virgin and Martyr (Nov. 22), A.D. 230. The patron saint of Sacred Music, learnt, according to the beautiful legend, from her guardian angel.¹
- S. FABIAN, Bishop and Martyr (Jan. 20). Bishop of Rome, martyred in the Decian persecution, A.D. 250.
- S. AGATHA, Virgin and Martyr (Feb. 5). Tortured to death in the Decian persecution, A.D. 251.
- S. LAWRENCE, Martyr (Aug. 10). Deacon of Rome: roasted to death in the Valerian persecution, A.D. 258.
- S. CYPRIAN, "Archbishop" (Sept. 26).² The famous Bishop of Carthage: beheaded in the Valerian persecution, A.D. 258.
- S. PRISCA, Virgin and Martyr (Jan 18). A girl of thirteen, martyred at Rome in A.D. 268.
- S. VALENTINE, Bishop (Feb. 14). Martyred in Italy, A.D. 270.
- S. MARGARET, Virgin and Martyr (July 20).³ Martyred at Antioch in Pisidia, A.D. 275. A type of meek and quiet womanliness.
- S. DENYS, Bishop (Oct. 9). Bishop of Paris, martyred A.D. 272. Patron saint of France.
- S. CRISPIN, Martyr (Oct. 25). A missionary companion of S. Denys; martyred at Soissons A.D. 287. Patron saint of shoemakers. [See also Shakespeare, "K. Hen. V." act iv., sc. 3, ll. 40-67.]
- S. LUCIAN, Priest and Martyr (Jan. 8). Another missionary companion of S. Denys: martyred at Beauvais, A.D. 290.
- S. FAITH, Virgin and Martyr (Oct. 6). Martyred in Aquitania, A.D. 290.

¹ Chaucer's "Second Nonnes' Tale" is a translation taken from S. Cecilia's life in the "Legenda Aurea." Compare Tennyson, "Palace of Art," st. 25.

² S. Cyprian, though not formally an Archbishop, exercised a kind of metropolitan jurisdiction in N. Africa. His day is shifted from the 14th to the 26th, the day of S. Cyprian of Antioch, because the 14th is Holy Cross Day,—see below, p. 361. S. Cyprian of *Antioch* was martyred in A.D. 304.

³ Commemorated by the Greek Church on July 17th.

ii. *Martyrs in the Diocletian Persecution, at the beginning of the Fourth Century.* (See § 11)

- S. GEORGE, Martyr (April 23). A military tribune, who tore down the Edict of Persecution when published at Nicomedia, the Imperial residence, in A.D. 303, and was tortured and beheaded. Patron saint of England since the Crusades.¹
- S. ALBAN, Martyr (June 17).² The protomartyr of Britain, A.D. 304. See § 11.
- S. LUCY, Virgin and Martyr (Dec. 13). A young lady of Syracuse, who boldly died for Christ, A.D. 304.
- S. AGNES, Virgin and Martyr (Jan. 21). A young girl of Rome, tortured to death in A.D. 305. A type of virgin innocence and purity.
- S. VINCENT, Martyr (Jan. 22). A Deacon of Saragossa in Spain, tortured to death in A.D. 304.
- S. CATHERINE, Virgin and Martyr (Nov. 25). A girl of high birth and education, tortured to death at Alexandria on a spiked wheel in A.D. 307.
- S. BLASIUS (S. BLAISE), Bishop and Martyr (Feb. 3). Tortured to death, A.D. 316, at Sebaste (in Armenia), with iron combs. Patron saint, therefore, of wool-combers.

iii. *Other Saints of the Fourth Century.* (Compare § 16)

- S. SILVESTER, Bishop (Dec. 31). Bishop of Rome, A.D. 314-35; famous in mediæval times as the alleged recipient of the forged "Donation of Constantine" (pp. 100, n. 2, 169, n. 2).
- S. NICOLAS, Bishop (Dec. 6). Bishop of Myra, and present at the Nicene Council, A.D. 325. Patron saint of sailors

¹ His conflict with the Dragon of persecution (compare Rev. xii.), was allegorized into the famous legend still commemorated upon our gold coinage. Compare the similar representation of S. Margaret; and the Vision of S. Perpetua.

² Really June 22nd, and so in the Sarum Calendar.

- and of children, especially orphans ("Santa Claus"). Patron saint also of Russia.
- S. EVURTIUS,¹ Bishop (Sept. 7). Bishop of Orleans, A.D. 340.
- S. HILARY, Bishop and Confessor² (Jan. 13). Bishop of Poitiers, A.D. 350-68. One of the early Latin Fathers, and an earnest supporter of Athanasius.
- S. AMBROSE, Bishop (April 4). Bishop of Milan, and ecclesiastical leader in the West, A.D. 374-97. The famous rebuker of the Emperor Theodosius in A.D. 390. One of the Latin Fathers, and the traditional author of the "Te Deum," the Western Church's great hymn of praise.
- S. MARTIN, Bishop (Nov. 11 and July 4).³ The famous Bishop of Tours, A.D. 371-97, unwearied in his zeal against heathenism.
- S. JEROME (Sept. 30). One of the greatest and most learned of the Latin Fathers, A.D. 342-420. (Compare pp. 16, n. 2, 180.)
- S. AUGUSTIN, Bishop (Aug. 28). Bishop of Hippo, in Africa, A.D. 393-430. With his contemporary, S. Jerome, he was the most famous of the Latin Fathers, and his "influence was dominant with all the great leaders of the Reformation." (See § 17.) He must not be confused with his namesake, the Archbishop of Canterbury (see below).
- S. BRITIUS (S. BRICE), Bishop (Nov. 13). The pupil and successor of S. Martin at Tours, A.D. 397-414. (See also § 90.)

iv. *Saints of the Sixth Century.* (See §§ 21, ff.)

- S. REMIGIUS (S. REMI), Bishop (Oct. 1). Bishop of Rheims, and Metropolitan. Famous as the baptizer of the heathen Clovis, King of the Franks, at Christmas, A.D.

¹ Enurchus is a mere misprint in the Prayer-Book.

² A Confessor, as distinguished from a Martyr, is one not called to suffer unto death for Christ.

³ The second Festival commemorates the translation of his remains

496. He held his Bishopric for seventy-two years, and died in A.D. 533.
- S. BENEDICT, Abbot (March 21). Born near Nursia : Abbot of Monte Cassino, A.D. 529-43, and founder of the great Benedictine Order (§ 32), which reformed and reorganized the whole system of Western monasticism.
- S. MACHUTUS (S. MACLOVIUS, or MALO), Bishop (Nov. 15). A Welsh saint : Bishop of Aleth, in Brittany, A.D. 541-64.
- S. DAVID, Archbishop¹ (March 1). Bishop of Caerleon, in Wales, and founder of the see named after him. He died probably in A.D. 601 (§ 22). Patron saint of Wales ; and hence the wearing of leeks on his day by Welshmen, in memory of his abstinence.
- S. LEONARD, Confessor (Nov. 6). A noble convert of S. Remi, renowned as a hermit. He died in A.D. 599. Patron saint of prisoners and captives.
- S. GREGORY² the Great, Bishop (March 12). Bishop of Rome, A.D. 590-604. See § 26.
- S. AUGUSTIN, Archbishop (May 26). First Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 597-604. (See §§ 26 ff.) Known as "the Less,"³ to distinguish him from the great African Father (p. 357).

v. *Saints of the Seventh and Eighth Centuries*

- S. CHAD, Bishop (March 2). The saintly English Bishop of Lichfield, A.D. 669-72. See §§ 46, 47.
- S. ETHELDREDA, Virgin (Oct. 17). Queen of Northumbria, foundress of the monastery at Ely, and one of the most famous of the early English saints. Abbess of Ely, A.D. 672-9. See § 52.

from Cande to Tours, July 4th, A.D. 478. "In England alone there are 160 churches dedicated to S. Martin." See also above, § 18.

¹ This name, in the loose Keltic organization of the Welsh Church, did not imply a permanent dignity.

² From him comes the "Gregorian" style of chanting.

³ He is so called in the Chronicle of Ethelwerd, A.D. 975.

- S. LAMBERT, Bishop (Sept. 17). A renowned missionary, Bishop of Maestricht: martyred for his bold rebuke of vice, A.D. 710.
- S. GILES (AEGIDIUS), Abbot (Sept. 1). A renowned hermit in the latter half of the seventh century; and founder of the abbey named after him, near Nismes. Patron saint of cripples.
- VENERABLE BEDE, Presbyter (May 27). A lifelong monk and student at Jarrow (A.D. 673-735). See § 68.
- S. BONIFACE, Bishop (June 5). The "Apostle of Germany" (A.D. 700-55). See § 69.

vi. Saints of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries

- S. SWITHUN, Bishop (July 15). Bishop of Winchester, A.D. 838-62. The translation of his remains to the Cathedral was contrary to his expressed wish in life, and was hindered, the story says, by a rain of forty days. Hence the popular belief.
- S. EDMUND, King (Nov. 20). King of East Anglia: martyred by the Danes, A.D. 870. See § 80.
- S. EDWARD, King of the West Saxons¹ (March 18 and June 20).² The tremendous impression made by his cruel death (see § 85, and the lines preserved in the "English Chronicle" under the year 979) led to the working of miracles at his tomb, and his eventual canonization.
- S. DUNSTAN, Archbishop (May 19). See §§ 83-85.

vii. Saints of the Eleventh and following Centuries

- S. ALPHEGE, Archbishop (April 19). Martyred by the Danes, A.D. 1011. See § 90.

¹ This title is added to distinguish S. Edward the Martyr from S. Edward the Confessor. See below.

² The second festival commemorates the translation of his remains from Wareham to Shaftesbury Abbey by S. Dunstan.

KING EDWARD, Translation of (Oct. 13).¹ S. Edward the Confessor, for two centuries the patron saint of England. See § 95.

S. HUGH, Bishop (Nov. 17). Bishop of Lincoln, A.D. 1186-1200. See § 131.

S. RICHARD, Bishop (April 13). A gentle, humble, and generous Bishop of Chichester, A.D. 1245-53.

KING CHARLES, Martyr (Jan. 30).² Executed, with gross illegality, by a knot of powerful rebels in A.D. 1649. In spite of much culpable weakness, this King refused to save his life by sacrificing the Church of England (compare pp. 294, n. 2, 315, n. 5), and died at last a martyr in the very cause of English liberty which he had once oppressed.

viii. Other Minor Festivals of the Church of England

- (a) S. Anne (July 26). Mother of the Blessed Virgin Mary. A Festival introduced into England by Queen Anne of Bohemia (§ 173).
- (b) The Conception³ (Dec. 8), Nativity (Sept. 8), and Visitation⁴ (July 2), of the Virgin Mary.
- (c) Beheading of S. John Baptist (Aug. 29). The (Red Letter) Festival of his *Nativity* (p. 353, n. 1) is on June 24th.
- (d) The Transfiguration (Aug. 6), and Name of JESUS (Aug. 7).⁵

¹ This commemorates the magnificent translation of his remains in A.D. 1163, by Archbishop Becket and King Henry II.

² His name has been omitted from the Kalendar by the printers without proper authority.

³ Our Church significantly omits the word "Immaculate." The latter idea was an invention of the thirteenth century, and was not finally accepted, even in the Church of Rome, till as recently as the year 1854.

⁴ I.e. the Visitation to Elisabeth, which produced the sweet strains of the "Magnificat," S. Luke, i. 39-56.

⁵ See p. 273, and note. Compare S. Matt. i. 21; S. Luke, i. 31-33; Acts, iv. 12, 30; Phil. ii. 9-11.

- (e) S. John Evang. "ante Portam Latinam" (May 6)—*i.e.* "before the Latin Gate," where, according to an early tradition, the Apostle was plunged unharmed into a cauldron of boiling oil, before being banished to Patmos.
- (f) Invention [*i.e.* Finding] of the Cross (May 3). This commemorates the famous story of the discovery of the Cross at Jerusalem by the Empress Helena, mother of Constantine the Great (see above, § 12) in A.D. 326.
- (g) Holy Cross Day¹ (Sept. 14). Commemoration of the public exhibition of the "True Cross" after its recovery from the Persians by the Emperor Heraclius in A.D. 628.
- (h) Lammas Day (Aug. 1.), *i.e.* "Loaf-Mass" Day (Anglo-Saxon hláfmoesse, from hláf, a loaf).² The Church's Harvest-Thanksgiving Day, in which bread made from the newly-taken harvest was used in the Holy Communion (compare Ex. xxiii. 16). A modern unauthorized custom which has crept in, with far less beauty and appropriateness, gives to God not the *first* fruits, but the *last* fruits, when "all is safely gathered in." Lammas Day is the festival of *Thanksgiving*, answering to the Rogation-tide *prayers* for the growing crops (compare Gen. viii. 22).

APPENDIX Q

FASTING. (See p. 282, n. 2)

"The Scriptures bid us *fast*; the Church says, *Now*."
GEORGE HERBERT.

The following remarks of the well-known Dr. Jaeger ("Health Culture," pp. 175-176), may be noted by those

¹ "Holy-rood day," Shakespeare, "K. Hen. IV." Part I., l. 52. "Rood, Anglo-Sax. ród, a gallows, cross, properly a rod or pole; Matt. xxvii. 40; John, xix. 17."—PROFESSOR SKEAT, *Etym. Dict.*, s.v.

² Professor Skeat, *op. cit.*, s.v. "Lammas."

who fear that the observance of the Church's rules will impair their bodily health: "Anyone possessed of the self-control necessary to make a trial of fasting will at once be convinced of the extraordinarily beneficial influence which is thereby exercised on the health and working powers, not only with such persons as banquet luxuriously, but with all classes. . . . Where fasting was, and is, prescribed by religion, it takes the form (1) of a weekly fast-day; (2) of a yearly fasting period; and both forms are, from a hygienical point of view, *absolutely correct*. . . . Not only can fasting restore the lowered vital energy, but it is in fact a remedial treatment directly indicated by nature; for in many illnesses the customary food smells disagreeably and excites disgust. . . . What has been lost sight of is, that this rule is not simply a cure, but is *periodically necessary* to counteract the accumulation of that which is termed tendency to disease. In short, I advise everyone to fast at regular intervals, if only by omitting on one day in the week the midday meal; or at least to observe a day of fasting when he notices a diminution of vital or working vigour. . . . It would be well if the observance of a weekly fast-day could again by custom become an ordinance, and where the practice still holds good, every effort should be made to maintain it. *I consider the Fast-day as hygienically imperative as the Sunday rest.*"

The weekly fast of Friday, as the mournful Crucifixion Day, is certainly coeval with Christianity itself (compare S. Matt. ix. 15 end),¹ and corresponds to the weekly *Festival* of Sunday (compare § 343, and note). And besides "all the Fridays in the year, except Christmas Day," the Prayer-Book enjoins also the "Forty Days of Lent,"² the "Ember

¹ See "Hymns Anc. and Mod." No. 480, ver. 4. The Wednesday and *Friday* fasts of the early Church are mentioned in the recently-discovered *Didache* (c. viii.), a very early Christian document, as well as in *Hermas* (Sim. v. 1).

² This period, commencing with Ash Wednesday, is so reckoned as not to include Sundays, which are *never* days of fasting. It commemorates our Lord's Fast in the wilderness, and is a time of solemn preparation for the Easter Festival. See the Collect for the first Sunday in Lent.

Days,"¹ the "Rogation Days,"² and the "Evens or Vigils"³ before certain festivals, to be observed as days of fasting or of (less rigorous) abstinence.⁴ The outward fasting must of course be accompanied by the inward fasting of the *heart*, shown in penitence and prayer, earnest efforts to conquer sin, and the doing of good to others⁵ in thankful love to Christ. Any money saved by fasting should be given to God in alms. Of course *all* indulgence in luxuries or worldly pleasures, should, as a rule, be avoided on the fasting-day.⁶

It is obvious that fasting, to be of any spiritual efficacy, must be *voluntary*. When so used, with proper discretion and the exercise of common sense, it is of the highest possible value.⁷ "Self-denial in things innocent is the best preparation for self-denial in things harmful. . . . If a man has not moral strength to refuse the pleasures of the table, how can he hope to stand firm against the allurements and the pleasures of sin?"⁸

¹ The Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday before the four annual Ordination Sundays. Compare Acts, xiii. 3, xiv. 23; and see Bingham, "Antiq." xxii., c. 2.

² The three days of preparation before Ascension Day (*Holy Thursday*). Used also as Days of procession or litany with special supplication for God's blessing on the growing crops. Compare p. 361.

³ See above, p. 353, n. 2.

⁴ Abstinence is "the mere abstaining from *animal* food, such things as eggs, milk, cheese, and butter not being forbidden."

⁵ See Is. lviii. 6, 7; S. Matt. xxv. 31 ff., for the necessity of these "works of mercy," done "not to be saved, but because we are saved."

⁶ "The practice of going to dinner-parties, balls, theatres, or other places of amusement, on Fridays, or during Lent, or on any other fasting-days, is a clear breach of the Church's rule, as laid down in the Book of Common Prayer."—STALEY, *The Practical Religion*, p. 206.

⁷ Compare Rom. viii. 13, and 1 Cor. ix. 27, where the original Greek is very strong. See also Gal. v. 24; S. Matt. xvi. 24.

⁸ Staley, *op. cit.*, pp. 202, 203, quoting Jer. xii. 5.

APPENDIX R

RELIGIOUS DISUNION. (See §§ 325, 330)

"Behold, how good and joyful a thing it is [for] brethren to dwell together in unity!"—*Ps. cxxxiii. 1, P. B. V.*

(1) "It is the glory of an enlightened and comprehensive body like the Church of England to include within her men who hold different opinions on various points of greater or less interest, but they are not therefore disunited; on the contrary, there is a marvellous amount of union between men whose views are widely divergent." (See above, §§ 1, 15.)

(2) "It is certain that heresies and schisms are of all others the greatest scandals: yea, more than corruption of manners: for as in the natural body a wound or solution of continuity is worse than a corrupt humour, so in the spiritual: so that nothing doth so much keep men out of the church, and drive men out of the church, as breach of unity. . . . When atheists and profane persons do hear of so many discordant and contrary opinions in religion, it doth avert them from the church, and maketh them 'to sit down in the chair of the scorners.'"—SIR FRANCIS BACON, *Essay iii. Of Unity in Religion.*

(3) "A master-characteristic of our modern Christendom is its *fratricidal dissensions*. Unity, which the Lord and Founder of the household made the distinguishing mark of His kingdom and the first condition of its missionary success, is positively thrown aside as of no importance whatever. Nay, some Christians have become so rooted and confirmed in habits of disagreement, that they have actually learned at last to 'glory in their shame.' . . .

"Are we about to throw up the problem in despair, and agree, not merely to differ [in opinion]—that men must always do—but to *separate*? Especially when we remember what severe things are said in Holy Scripture about 'those

that separate themselves';¹ how in a deeply touching passage, the temper which stands up defiantly upon its rights is said to be diametrically opposite to 'the mind which was in Christ Jesus';² and how *διχοστασία*, the spirit of non-conformity, the act of standing apart from one's brethren, is unsparingly and repeatedly chastised by St. Paul³ as a thing to be rebuked, a carnal sin, a childish petulance, one among the 'manifest works of the flesh.'

"Men have been brought by slow degrees to see at last that force and persecution were the weapons of Antichrist and not of Christ; and that charity, courtesy, and honest explanation were the only fitting weapons of a warfare which is 'not carnal but spiritual,' and whose only lasting victories are gained by 'in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves.'⁴ . . . May the blessed ancient way of peace and mutual explanation be remembered and be the principle henceforth of every controversy in which, as churchmen, we engage. For the battle is not to the strong or to the violent. 'The *meek* shall possess the earth.'"⁵—CANON CURTEIS, *Dissent in its Relation to the Church of England*, pp. 21, 23-24, 32-33.

¹ Jude, v. 19.

² Phil. ii. 5 ff.

³ Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 3; Gal. v. 20.

⁴ 2 Cor. x. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 25.

⁵ Ps. xxxvii. 11; S. Matt. v. 5. [Will every reader of these pages kneel down and repeat, as a prayer from the heart, Hymn 216 (Anc. and Mod.), "What time the evening shadows fall"?]

INDEX

(*The Numbers refer to the Pages*)

- Abstinence, 363 n. 4.
Adrian, Abbot, 39, 47; IV., Pope, 100; VI., Pope, 171 n. 2, 217 n. 1.
Aidan, Saint, 32, 316.
Alban, Saint, 12, 356.
Albigenses, 105 f., 114 n. 2.
Alcuin, 58, 60 f.
Aldfrid, King, 48, 50.
Aldhelm, 47, 54.
Alien priories, 160.
Alphege, Saint, 72, 359.
Altars, demolition of, 250 f.
America, discovery of, 172.
Anabaptists, 248, 281, 294.
Andrewes, Bishop, 308; quoted, 343.
Annates Act, 199.
Anne of Bohemia, 153, 158 n. 4, 360.
Anselm, Saint, 86 f., 89, 91 f., 94.
Apocrypha, 213 and n. 1.
Appeals, Statute of, 200.
Aquinas, Saint Thomas, 123, 141, 177 n. 1; cited, 158 n. 1, 220 n. 2, 328 n. 1, 344 n., 351 n. 1.
Architecture, styles of, 148 n. 1.
Aristotle, 123, 124 n. 1.
Armada, Spanish, 260, 291 n. 1, 300, 303, 305.
Arthur, King, 20, 189 n.
Articles, Ten, 218 ff.: Thirteen, 225, 254; Six, 226; Forty-two, 254; Thirty-nine, 254 n. 3, 280 f: cited, 17, 46 n. 2, 204 n. 2, 207, 213 n. 1, 219 f., 239, 245 n. 6, 247 n. 3, 251 n. 2, 283 n. 1, 308 n. 1, 327 n. 1, 328 n. 2, 330, 332, 336, 338 n. 1, 346 n. 4, 348 n. 4.
Assyrian Mission, the, 21 n. 1.
Athanasius, 14, 16; Creed of, 15 n. 2, 19 n. 3, 345 ff.
Athelstan, King, 67, 320.
Atonement, the, 3, 338 ff., 342 n. 3.
Augsburg, Confession of, 217.
Augustine, Saint, 17, 357; the Less, 25 ff., 318, 358.
Babylonian Captivity, the, 139.
Bacon, Roger, 123.
Bancroft, Bishop, 305.
Baptism, 3, 4, 218, 245.
Baptists, 248 n. 2.
Barlowe, Bishop, 227 n. 1, 275.
Basle, Council of, 166.
Becket, Archbishop, 102 ff., 110, 156 n. 1, 225.
Bede, the Venerable, 42, 55, 66, 359.
Benedict, Saint, 29 n. 3, 358.
Berengar, 82 f., 329.
Bernard, Saint, 82, 96 f., 106 n. 2.
Bible, Wycliffe's, 150, 153, 155, 158, 187; Luther's, 213, 217; Tyndale's, 186 f., 212 n. 1, 224, 232; Coverdale's, 212; Matthew's, 224; Great, or Cranmer's, 228; Taverner's, 228; Geneva, 277 f., 288; Bishops', 287; Welsh, 288 n. 1; Douai and Rhemish, 301. *See also Vulgate.*

- Bible-reading forbidden, 158, 232 ; allowed, 158 n. 4, 212, 224.
- Bilson, Bishop, 305.
- Bishops, 6ff., 15, 310ff.; nominated by Crown, 52f., 73, 91, 104, 144, 203, 240; election of, 92 n. 3, 144, 203, 241 n., 271; seat in House of Lords, 53, 83, 125, 128.
- Bishops' Book*, the, 223.
- Black Book*, the, 214.
- Black Death*, the, 146, 151.
- Bluecoat School*, the, 256.
- Boleyn, Anne, 190 n. 1, 191, 200, 202, 216, 229.
- Boniface, Saint, 56 f., 319, 359 ; VIII., Pope, 132 ff., 137 f., 141.
- Bonner, Bishop, 212, 228, 239 f., 257, 262.
- Bowing in Divine Service, 46 n. 1, 273.
- Brethren*, 3 n. 9.
- Brice, Saint, 357.
- Brownists, 293.
- Bulls, Papal, 133 n. 2.
- Burial Service, the, 246.
- Caedmon, 39.
- Calvin, 250 n. 1, 252, 268, 308.
- Cambridge, 33, 66 n. 1, 89 n. 1, 109, 122, 170, 173, 185 n. 2, 196, 235, 238 n. 4.
- Canon Law, 84, 98, 198.
- Canterbury, 25, 27 n. 1; Archbishops of, 313 ff.
- Cardinals, the, 79, 110 n. 1, 209 n.
- Carlisle, Statute of, 138.
- Caroline Books*, the, 60.
- Carthusians, 96 f., 208.
- Catechism, the, 246 n. 2.
- Cecilia, Saint, 355.
- Celibacy, Clerical, 13, 68, 79, 93, 156, 247, 259.
- Chad, Saint, 32, 34, 40 f., 43, 358.
- Chancellor, office of, 100 n. 1.
- Chantries, 241 f.
- Charlemagne, 56, 58, 60.
- Charles I., King, 359.
- Charter, the Great, 117 f., 133 n. 3.
- Charterhouse, 208 n. 2.
- Chaucer, 148; cited, 1, 122 n. 2, 124 n., 131, 142 n. 1, 156 n. 1 and n. 2, 219 n. 6, 278, 332, 355 n. 1.
- Chelsea, Council of, 58, 319.
- Chronicle, the English, 66; cited, 95 n. 1, 359.
- Church of England founded, 25, 35 n. ; organized, 38, 41, 49; supposed disunion in, 364.
- Churches, Free*, a misnomer, 7 n. 4, 270 n. 4, 318.
- Churching of Women, 246.
- Cistercians, 96.
- Clarendon, Constitutions of, 103.
- Clement of Rome, 4 n. 10, 9 n. 3, 11, 15 n. 4, 313, 338 n. 4, 354; of Alexandria, 5 n. 5, 11.
- Clergy, Benefit of, 101, 103 n. 2, 179.
- Colet, Dean, 173, 175, 178.
- Colleges, foundation of, 170.
- Columba, Saint, 22 f.
- Columban, Saint, 22.
- Comfortable Words*, the, 342 n. 3.
- Commons, House of, 128, 143.
- Confession, 113, 219, 247, 349 ff.
- Confirmation, 4, 246.
- Congregationalism, 5 n. 2, 294.
- Constance, Council of, 162.
- Constantine the Great, 12 ff., 361 ; *Donation* of, 100 n. 2, 169 n. 2, 356.
- Constantinople, 14, 21, 59 f., 167, 169.
- Conversion, 219, 246.
- Convocations, the, 129 f.
- Councils, General, 46, 150, 162, 285.
- Court of Delegates, 203.
- Coverdale, 212, 228, 275.
- Cranmer, Archbishop, 195, 200ff., 207, 212, 216, 226 ff., 243, 248 f., 251 ff., 255 n. 1, 257 f., 263 f., 333.
- Cromwell, Thomas, 195, 211 ff., 226, 229 f.
- Crusades, 71, 88, 111, 127.
- Cup withheld from laity, 163, 240.
- Cuthbert, Saint, 39 f., 48.
- Cyprian, Saint, 11, 355.

- Dante, 136.
 David, Saint, 21, 358.
 Decretals, the forged, 64, 79, 98.
Didache, the, 5 n. 4, 339 n. 1, 362 n. 1.
 Dioceses, origin of, 7; English, 47.
 Diocletian Persecution, the, 11 f., 356.
 Discipline, Book of, 301.
 Divorce, 190 f., 340 n. 3.
 Dominicans, the, 121 f., 155 n. 3.
 Dorchester, 33, 38 n. 4, 40, 85.
 Dunstan, Saint, 67 ff., 359.
- Easter, date of, 13, 28 n. 3.
Eastward Position, the, 339 n. 3.
 Edmund, Saint, 65, 359; of Abingdon, 120, 123.
 Edward the Confessor, 76, 360; the Martyr, 68, 359; VI., birth of, 224.
 Egbert, Archbishop, 57, 317 n. 4, 319; King, 52, 62.
 Electors, the German, 182 n.
 Ely,¹ 43 n. 2, 62, 65, 68, 73, 85, 93, 215, 234, 297 n. 4, 358.
 Ember Days, 362.
Emperor, title of English Kings, 88 n. 1.
 Endowments, Church, 26, 48, 54, 61, 75, 130, 134, 147, 152, 160, 236, 318.
 Erasmus, 173, 175, 180, 181 n. 3, 217.
 Estates, the Three, 128 f., 130 n. 1, 143, 145.
 Ethelburga, 30 f., 36.
 Etheldreda, Saint, 34, 42 f., 358.
 Ethelwulf, Donation of, 63, 319.
 Eutychianism, 19, 21.
- Fasting, 282 n. 2, 361 f.
 Felix, Bishop, 32, 35.
Filioque, the, 80 n. 4, 87 n. 2.
 Fisher, Bishop, 175, 183 n., 205, 209, 211.
 Florence, Council of, 166.
- Foxe, John, 283.
 Friars, the, 120 ff., 146, 167 n. 4.
 Friday, observance of, 362 f.
 Fryth, John, 204.
- Gardiner, Bishop, 201, 211, 230, 240, 252 n. 3, 257, 260 ff.
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, 97 n. 3.
 George, Saint, 356.
 Gerbert, 71 n. 4.
 German, Saint, 17.
 Gibraltar, 37 n. 1.
 Gildas, 8, 12, 22.
 Glastonbury, 10, 54, 223.
Good Friday, 26 n. 2.
 Gottschalk, 64, 308.
 Gregory, Saint, 24, 26 ff., 35 n., 59 n. 2, 358.
 Grey, Lady Jane, 256, 260 n. 1.
 Grindal, Archbishop, 297.
 Grosseteste, Bishop, 120, 124, 148, 184 n. 1.
 Guilds, mediæval, 241.
- Hatfield, Synod of, 45.
 Hegira, the, 36.
 Hertford, Synod of, 42.
 High Commission, Court of, 270 n. 3, 302, 303 n. 1.
 Hilda, Saint, 38 n. 2, 39.
 Hildebrand, 79, 83, 86 n. 1, 87 n. 1, 88 n. 2, 90, 96, 247.
 Holy Island, 32.
Holy Roman Empire, the, 58 n. 3, 70 n. 1, 78, 90.
 Homilies, the, 238 f., 282, 283 n. 1; cited, 2 n. 1, 59 n. 3, 70 n. 2, 80 n. 4, 133 n. 1, 204 n. 2, 213 n. 1, 219 n. 4, 220 n. 1, 246 n. 3, 282 n. 2, 283 n. 1, 330 n. 4.
 Hooker, Richard, 306; cited *passim*.
 Hooper, Bishop, 248 n. 1, 249, 262.
 Hugh of Lincoln, Saint, 112, 360.
 Hus, John, 163.

¹ The first draft of this book was written for a parish magazine at Ely. Such of the local allusions as seem to be of any general interest are retained.

- Ignatius, Saint, 11; Epistles of, 311 ff., 339 n. 1.
- Image-worship, 37 n. 3, 59 f., 156, 220, 282, 284, 324.
- Imitation of Christ*, the, 174.
- Imperial Federation*, 43.
- Incarnation, the, 3, 46, 326 n. 2, 348 n. 4; controversies on, 15, 18 ff., 44 ff.
- Independents, 293 f.
- Indulgences, 88, 163 n. 1, 181, 220, 331 f.
- Ine, King, 52, 54 f., 66.
- Infallibility*, Papal, 45 n. 4, 171 n. 2, 217 n. 1, 324.
- Innocent III., Pope, 112 ff., 119 n. 3, 247, 351.
- Inquisition, the, 114 n. 2, 121 n. 3, 158 n. 1; revived, 171, 260 n. 2, 270 n. 1.
- Investiture Struggle, the, 89 ft.
- Iona, 22, 32, 35.
- Jesuits, 299 f.
- JESUS, Name of, 273, 360.
- Jewell, Bishop, 280, 306.
- Jews, persecution of, 131.
- Joachim, Abbot, 121 n. 1, 139 n. 1.
- Justiciar, office of, 111 n. 3.
- Kalendar, the English, 278, 353 ff.
- King's Book*, the, 231.
- Knights Templars, 140.
- Knox, John, 268.
- Lambeth Articles*, the, 308.
- Lambeth Conference, 42, 277, 281 n. 5.
- Lammas Day, 361.
- Lanfranc, Archbishop, 82.
- Langland [A.D. 1362-80], quoted, 136, 146 n. 3.
- Langton, Archbishop, 114 ff.
- Latimer, Bishop, 212, 227, 248, 254, 258, 263.
- Legatus Natus*, office of, 95.
- Leicester, 47, 49, 194.
- Lent, observance of, 362.
- Leo X., Pope, 182.
- Leonard, Saint, 358.
- Lewis of France, Saint, 126 f.
- Lichfield, 41, 47, 57 f., 85.
- Lights on Holy Table, significance of, 238 n. 2.
- Lincoln, 13, 31 n. 1, 47, 85, 93, 112, 124; Parliament of, 137.
- Litany, the English, 232.
- Livings, poverty of, 322 n. 2.
- Lollards, the, 152, 155 ff., 160 f., 167.
- Lombard, Peter the, 109; quoted, 344.
- London, early Bishops of, 13, 29, 34; Mayor of, 117 n. 3.
- Lords, House of, 53, 125, 143.
- Lucius, King, 9, 33.
- Luther, Martin, 181 ff., 216 ff., 233 n. 1.
- Martin Marprelate Tracts*, 303.
- Martin, Saint, 18, 357; V., Pope, 162, 164 f.
- Mary Queen of Scots, 288 f., 291, 303.
- Matthew Paris, 115 n. 1, 120.
- Minor Orders, the, 101.
- Mohammedans, the, 36 f., 59, 71 n. 4, 88, 115. *See also* Turks.
- Monasteries, the, 16, 21 f., 33, 42, 63, 66, 68, 110, 160, 183 ff., 213 ff., 233 ff., 321.
- Monophysites, 21.
- Monotheilism, 44 f.
- Montfort, Simon de, 120, 125.
- More, Sir T., 173, 183 n., 194, 200, 204 f., 209, 211 f.
- Mortmain, Statute of, 132.
- Nag's Head Fable*, 276.
- Nestorianism, 19.
- Nicene Creed, the, 13.
- Nicolas, Saint, 356; V., Pope, 166, 169.
- Ninian, Saint, 18.
- Nonconformists, 295 n. 1.
- Offa, King, 52, 57 f., 319.
- Oldcastle, Sir John, 161.
- Ornaments Rubric*, the, 238 n. 2, 244, 271, 272 n. 1.

- Oswald, King, 31 ff.
 Oswy, King, 31 n. 2, 34, 38, 40 f., 43 n. 1.
 Overall, Bishop, 244 n. 4, 308.
 Oxford, 66 n. 1, 98, 109, 122, 145, 170, 173, 175, 177, 185, 196, 235, 238 n. 4.
 Paganism, 7 n. 3.
 Pall, the, 26, 79, 83, 95, 314 n.
 Papacy, growth of claims of, 14 n. 1, 22, 27 n. 5, 43, 45, 52 f., 57, 59 n. 3, 65, 75, 79 f., 94 f., 100 n. 2, 110, 112 ff., 119 f., 124 f., 133, 137, 164, 168, 285; Triple Crown of, 133 n. 1.
 Papal Schism, the, 136, 149, 159, 162.
 Parker, Archbishop, 274, 277, 282 f., 286 ff., 296.
 Parochial System, the, 47, 316 f.
 Patrick, Saint, 18, 22.
 Patronage, origin of, 317 n. 1.
 Paul III., Pope, 209, 211, 284; IV., Pope, 261 n. 1, 265, 270 n. 1.
 Paulinus, 30 f., 316.
 Paul's Cathedral, S., 29, 85 n. 2, 116, 156 n. 1, 178, 226 n. 1, 228, 243.
 Peckham, Archbishop, 132.
 Pecocke, Bishop, 167.
 Pelagius, 17, 20 n.
 Penance, 219, 331, 352.
 Penda, King, 31, 34.
 Perpetua, Saint, 354.
 Peterborough, 202 n. 2, 235.
Peter's Pence, 58, 63, 81, 203.
Pilgrimage of Grace, the, 222.
 Pilgrimages, 156 n. 1, 176, 226.
 Pisa, Council of, 159.
 Pius IV., Pope, 279, 284; V., Pope, 291.
 Pole, Cardinal, 211, 259, 261, 265, 333.
Pope, the title, 35 n.
 Popery, English hatred of, 262, 283, 300.
 Præmunire, Statutes of, 145, 154, 164, 192, 193 n. 1, 197, 209 n., 261.
 Prayer-Book, the English, 27, 86, 243 ff., 253, 271 f., 281; Latin, 277.
 Presbyterianism, 268, 269 n. 2, 295, 301, 304 n.
 Prince Consort, the, 126 n. 3, 216 n. 3.
 Printing, invention of, 169, 184, 187.
Prophesyings, the, 298.
Protestants, origin of name, 217.
Provisions, of Oxford, 125; Papal, 119, 139, 143; Statutes against, 138, 144, 154, 164, 193 n. 2., 261.
 Prymers, 213, 232.
 Psalms, Prayer-Book version of, 228; Latin names of, 244 n. 2; Metrical, 278.
 Purgatory, 220, 284, 336.
 Puritans, 287, 295, 301 f., 307.
 Quakers, the, 294 n. 3.
Queen Anne's Bounty, 199.
Quia Emptores, Statute of, 134.
 Rectors, Lay, 236, 322.
Reformation Parliament, the, 196, 215.
 Regeneration, 3, 219 n. 5, 245, 246 n. 3.
 Registers, Parish, 226, 238, 308.
Regium Donum, the, 135 n. 2.
 Regulars and Seculars, 68.
 Renaissance, the, 169, 172, 188, 305.
 Ridley, Bishop, 239, 243 n. 1, 249 f., 258, 263.
 Rimini, Council of, 14, 16.
 Rochester, See of, 29, 31, 234.
 Rogation Days, 283, 363.
 Roman Catholics, 1, 27, 52, 96, 291 f., 301.
 Rome, corruptions of, 69, 78, 124, 139, 164, 285, 324.
 Round Churches, 141.
 Sacerdotalism, 339 n. 3.
 Sacraments, 3; principle of, 327.
Santa Claus, 357.
 Sarum, Use of, 85.

- Savonarola, 171.
 Sawtrey, William, 158.
 Schoolmen, the, 108, 123, 141.
 Scotus, Joannes, 64; Duns, 141.
 Self-surrender, Christian, 342.
 Shakespeare, 305.
 Somerset, Duke of, 237, 242 f., 248.
 Stigand, Archbishop, 75, 82.
Submission of the Clergy, the, 198, 200, 202.
 Sunday, observance of, 307.
 Supererogation, Works of, 331.
 Supremacy, the Royal, 49 f., 52, 73, 81, 103, 110, 132 f., 137, 144 f., 155, 178 ff., 197 f., 206 ff., 240, 258, 261, 270, 333.
Sursum Corda, the, 343 n. 2.
 Swithun, Saint, 359.
Tate and Brady, 278.
Te Deum, the, 357.
 Theodore, Archbishop, 39 ff., 316, 319.
Theotokos, the title, 19 n. 1.
 Thomists and Scotists, 141.
 Tintern Abbey, 97.
 Tithes, 58, 235 f., 318 ff.
 Toleration, 294 n. 1, 304, 309.
 Tonstall, Bishop, 207, 211, 255, 257 n. 2, 263.
 Tonsure, clerical, 28 n. 5, 39.
 Transubstantiation, 19 n. 1, 64, 71, 82 f., 151 f., 156, 158, 204 n. 3, 227, 258, 284, 324, 327 n. 1.
 Treason Act, the, 208.
 Trent, Council of, 233 n., 254, 280, 284 f., 299.
 Trinity Sunday, 102.
 Turks, the, 88, 140 n. 2, 166 f., 169, 218.
 Tyndale, William, 186, 195, 212, 221.
- Unam Sanctam*, the Bull, 137.
 Undenominationalism, 7 n. 4, 16 n. 1, 74, 293, 364. *See* Preface.
 Uniformity, Acts of, 244, 253, 272.
 Universities, the, 108 f., 170. *See also* Cambridge, Oxford.
 Utopia, 194.
- Vicars, 236, 321.
 Vigils, 353 n. 2, 363.
 Vikings, the, 63 n. 2.
 Vulgate, the, 172, 180, 187.
- Waldenses, the, 106 n. 3.
 Wales, Church of, 2, 20 f., 23, 28, 93; recent attack on, 93, 148, 161.
 Wales, Prince of, 134.
 Warham, Archbishop, 176 f., 180, 189, 200.
 Wesley, John, 2 n. 1, 325, 337, 343 n. 5, 353.
 Westminster Abbey, 29, 76, 127, 235, 242, 255.
 Whitby, Council of, 38.
 Whitgift, Archbishop, 295 f., 298 n. 2, 301 ff., 308.
 Whit-Sunday, 26 n. 2.
 Wilfrid, Bishop, 38, 40 ff., 48, 50 f., 316.
 Willibrord, 50, 56.
 Winchelsea, Archbishop, 133.
 Winchester, 33, 38 n. 4, 85, 148, 234.
 Witan, the, 53.
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 177 ff.
 Wyatt, Sir T., 260.
 Wyycliffe, John, 142 f., 145 ff., 163 n. 1, 166 n. 2, 187.
 Wykeham, William of, 148.
- York, 12, 30, 40 f., 95 n. 3.
- Zwingli, 217, 252, 325, 342.

YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN,

October 1897.

SELECTED LIST OF
THEOLOGICAL WORKS
PUBLISHED BY
GEORGE BELL & SONS.

A KEMPIS. On the Imitation of Christ. A New Translation. By the Rt. Rev. H. Goodwin, D.D. *3rd edition.* With fine Steel Engraving after Guido, 3s. 6d.; without the Engraving, 2s. 6d. Cheap edition, 1s. cloth; 6d. sewed.

ALFORD (Dean). The Greek Testament. With a critically revised Text; a Digest of various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena; and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. For the Use of Theological Students and Ministers. By the late Henry Alford, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. 4 vols. 8vo. 5l. 2s. Sold separately.

— The New Testament for English Readers. Containing the Authorised Version, with additional Corrections of Readings and Renderings, Marginal References, and a Critical and Explanatory Commentary. In 4 Parts. 2l. 14s. 6d. Sold separately.

ANTONINUS, The Thoughts of Marcus Aurelius. Translated Literally, with Notes, Biographical Sketch, Introductory Essay on the Philosophy, and Index, by George Long, M.A. Printed at the Chiswick Press, on hand-made paper. Pott 8vo. 6s. (*Or in Bohn's Classical Library*, 3s. 6d.)

AUGUSTINE. De Civitate Dei. Books XI. and XII. By the Rev. Henry Gee, B.D., F.S.A. I. Text only, 2s. II. Introduction, Literal Translation, and Notes, 3s.

— In Joannis Evangelium Tractatus. XXIV.-XXVII. Edited by the Rev. Henry Gee, B.D., F.S.A., 1s. 6d. Also the Translation by the late Rev. Canon H. Brown, 1s. 6d.

BARRETT (A. C.) Companion to the Greek Testament. For the Use of Theological Students and the Upper Forms in Schools. By A. C. Barrett, M.A., Caius College. *6th edition, revised.* Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

BARRY (Dr.) Notes on the Catechism. For the Use of Schools. By the Rev. Canon Barry, D.D., Principal of King's College, London. *10th edition.* Fcap. 2s.

BIRKS (T. R.) *Horæ Evangelicæ, or The Internal Evidence of the Gospel History.* By the Rev. T. R. Birks, M.A., late Hon. Canon of Ely. Edited by the Rev. H. A. Birks, M.A., late Scholar of Trin. Coll., Camb. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

BLEEK (F.) *An Introduction to the Old Testament.* By Friedrich Bleek. Edited by Johann Bleek and Adolf Kamphausen. Translated from the Second Edition of the German by G. H. Venables, under the supervision of the Rev. E. Venables, Residentiary Canon of Lincoln. *2nd edition, with Corrections.* With Index. 2 vols. 10s. (*Bohn's Theological Library.*)

BURBIDGE (Rev. E.) *Liturgies and Offices of the Church for the use of English Readers, in illustration of the Growth and Devotional value of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Catalogue of the remains of the Library of Archbishop Cranmer.* By Edward Burbidge, M.A. Prebendary of Wells. Cr. 8vo. 9s.

— *The Parish Priest's Book of Offices and Instructions for the Sick : with Appendix of Readings and Occasional Offices.* 6th edition, small post 8vo. 3s. 6d.

BURGON (Dean). *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established.* By the late John William Burgon, B.D., Dean of Chichester. Arranged, Completed, and Edited, by Edward Miller, M.A., Wykehamical Prebendary of Chichester Cathedral. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

— *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels.* Edited by the Rev. Edward Miller, M.A. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

BUTLER'S (Bp.) *Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature ; together with Two Dissertations on Personal Identity and on the Nature of Virtue, and Fifteen Sermons.* Edited, with Analytical Introductions, Explanatory Notes, a short Memoir, and a *Portrait.* Small post 8vo. 3s. 6d.

COLERIDGE. *Aids to Reflection ; Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit ; and Essays on Faith and the Common Prayer-book.* New Edition, revised, small post 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CRUDEN'S *Concordance to the Old and New Testament, or an Alphabetical and Classified Index to the Holy Bible, specially adapted for Sunday-school Teachers, containing nearly fifty-four thousand references.* Thoroughly revised and condensed by G. H. Hannay. Fcap. 8vo. 2s.

DENTON (W.) A Commentary on the Gospels and Epistles for the Sundays and other Holy Days of the Christian Year, and on the Acts of the Apostles. By the Rev. W. Denton, M.A., Worcester College, Oxford, and Incumbent of St. Bartholomew's, Cripplegate. In 7 vols. each 9s.
Commentary on the Gospels. 3 vols.
Commentary on the Epistles. 2 vols.
Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. 2 vols.

DOUGLAS (Helen.) The Silver Cross. A Selection of Poems for the Sick and Suffering. Edited by Helen Douglas, with an Introduction by the Lord Bishop of St. Andrew's. Printed in red and black on antique paper at the Chiswick Press. Pott 8vo. 3s. 6d.

EPICTETUS. The Discourses of. With the ENCHEIRIDION and Fragments. Translated with Notes, a Life of Epictetus, a view of his Philosophy, and Index by George Long, M.A. 2 vols. pott 8vo. Printed on hand-made paper, and bound in buckram, 10s. 6d. (*Or in Bohn's Classical Library*, 5s.)

EUSEBIUS. Ecclesiastical History. Translated by Rev. C. F. Cruse. 5s. (*Bohn's Theological Library.*)

FLETCHER (R. J.) The Old Law and the New Age. Nine Sermons by the Rev. R. J. Fletcher, Curate of St. Saviour's, South Hampstead. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

GARNIER (T. P.) Church or Dissent? An Appeal to Holy Scripture, addressed to Dissenters. By T. P. Garnier, late Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. 2nd edition. Crown 8vo. 2s.; in stiff paper cover for distribution, 1s.

GOODWIN (Bp.) Plain Thoughts concerning the Meaning of Holy Baptism. By the Rt. Rev. Harvey Goodwin, D.D., late Bishop of Carlisle. 2nd edition. 2d., or 25 for 3s. 6d.

— Confirmation Day. A Book of Instruction for Young Persons how to spend that day. 26th thousand. 2d., or 25 for 3s. 6d.

— The Worthy Communicant; or, 'Who may come to the Supper of the Lord?' 11th thousand. 2d., or 25 for 3s. 6d.

HARDWICK (C.) History of the Articles of Religion. By Charles Hardwick. 3rd edition revised. 5s. (*Bohn's Theological Library.*)

HAWKINS (Canon). Family Prayers:—Containing Psalms, Lessons, and Prayers, for every Morning and Evening in the Week. By the late Rev. Ernest Hawkins, B.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's. 20th edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

HOOK (W. F.) The Christian Taught by the Church's Services. Revised edition. Fcap. 8vo. Large type. 6s. 6d. Royal 32mo. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; calf, gilt edges. 4s. 6d.

HOOK (W. F.) Short Meditations for Every Day in the Year. Edited by the late Very Rev. W. F. Hook, D.D. *Revised edition.* 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. Large type. 14s. Also 2 vols. 32mo. Cloth, 5s.; calf, gilt edges, 9s.

— Holy Thoughts and Prayers, arranged for Daily Use on each Day of the Week, according to the stated Hours of Prayer. *8th edition.* 16mo. Cloth, red edges, 2s.; calf, gilt edges, 3s. *Cheap edition,* 3d.

HUMPHRY (W. G.) An Historical and Explanatory Treatise on the Book of Common Prayer. By W. G. Humphry, B.D. *6th edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

JOHNSTONE (R.) Parochial Addresses and Lessons. A Series of Readings for such as are tried by Sickness, Infirmitiy, and Age. By Richard Johnstone, M.A., Rector of Moreton Say. Fcap. 8vo. limp cloth, for the pocket, 3s.

JOSEPHUS. The Works of Flavius Josephus. Whiston's Translation, Revised by the Rev. A. R. SHILLETO, M.A. In five vols. Each 3s. 6d. (*Bohn's Standard Library.*)

KEITH-FALCONER. Memorials of the Hon. Ion Keith-Falconer, Missionary to the Mohammedans of Southern Arabia. By the Rev. Robert Sinker, D.D. With Portrait. *6th edition.* Crown 8vo. limp cloth, 2s. 6d.

LATHAM (H.) Pastor Pastorum; or, the Schooling of the Apostles by our Lord. By the Rev. Henry Latham, M.A., Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. *3rd thousand.* Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

— The Risen Master. A Sequel to 'Pastor Pastorum.' Crown 8vo. (*In the press.*)

— A Service of Angels. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

LEWIN (T.) The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. By Thomas Lewin, M.A., F.S.A. *5th edition.* Illustrated with numerous fine Engravings on Wood, Maps, and Plans. 2 vols. demy 4to. 2l. 2s.

LLOYD (J.) Sermons on Old Testament Characters. By the Rev. Julius Lloyd, M.A., Canon of Manchester, Rural Dean of Oldham, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

— Sermons on the Prophets. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

— Christian Politics. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

MEHAYIL EL HAYIL. From Strength to Strength. Short Readings for Jewish Children. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

MILLER (E.) Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. By Rev. E. Miller, M.A., Oxon, Rector of Bucknell, Bicester. Crown 8vo. 4s.

— The Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Held at New College on May 6th, 1897. With a Preface Explanatory of the Rival Systems by Rev. E. Miller, M.A., Oxon. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

MONSELL (Dr.) Watches by the Cross. Short Meditations, Hymns, and Litanies on the Last Seven Words of our Lord. *4th edition.* Cloth, red edges, 1s.

MONSELL (Dr.) Near Home at Last. A Poem. *12th thousand.* Cloth, red edges. Imp. 32mo. 2s. 6d.

— Our New Vicar; or, Plain Words about Ritual and Parish Work. Fcap. 8vo. *13th edition.* 2s. 6d.

— The Winton Church Catechism. Questions and Answers on the Teaching of the Church Catechism. *5th edition.* 32mo. cloth, 3s.

MOZLEY (Rev. F. W.) David in the Psalms, with Various Notes on the Psalter. By the Rev. F. W. Mozley, M.A. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

NEANDER (Augustus.) Theological Works. Small post 8vo. 3s. 6d. per vol. (*Bohn's Standard Library.*)

— History of the Christian Religion and Church. Translated by J. Torrey. 10 vols.

— Life of Jesus Christ, in its Historical Connexion and Development. Translated by J. M'Clintock and C. Blumenthal.

— History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles. Together with the Antignostikus, or Spirit of Tertullian. Translated by J. E. Ryland. 2 vols.

— Lectures on the History of Christian Dogmas. Edited by Dr. Jacobi. Translated by J. E. Ryland. 2 vols.

— Memorials of Christian Life in the Early and Middle Ages. Translated by J. E. Ryland.

PALMER (G. H.) The Sarum Psalter : The Psalms of David pointed to the eight Gregorian tones as given in the Sarum Tonale. By the Rev. G. H. Palmer, B.A., sometime Master of the Quire of St. Barnabas, Pimlico. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

PASCAL. The Thoughts of Blaise Pascal. Translated from the Text of M. Auguste Molinier by C. Kegan Paul. 3s. 6d. (*Bohn's Standard Library.*)

PEROWNE (Bp.) The Book of Psalms : a New Translation, with Introductions and Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By the Right Rev. J. J. Stewart Perowne, D.D., Bishop of Worcester. 8vo. Vol. I. *8th edition, revised.* 18s. Vol. II. *8th edition, revised.* 16s.

— The Book of Psalms. An abridged Edition for Schools and Private Students. Crown 8vo. *8th edition.* 10s. 6d.

PEARSON (Bp.) Exposition of The Creed. 5s. Edited by E. Walford, M.A. (*Bohn's Theological Library.*)

PHILO-JUDAeus, Works of. Translated by Prof. C. D. Yonge, M.A. 4 vols. 5s. each. (*Bohn's Theological Library.*)

PRUDENTIUS. Selected Passages, with Verse Translations on the opposite pages. By the Rev. F. St. John Thackeray, late Assistant Master, Eton College. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SADLER (M. F.) The Gospel of St. Matthew. By the Rev. M. F. Sadler, Rector of Honiton and Prebendary of Wells. With Notes, Critical and Practical, and Two Maps. *6th edition.* Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— The Gospel of St. Mark. *6th edition.* Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— The Gospel of St. Luke. Crown 8vo. *5th edition,* 9s.

— The Gospel of St. John. *6th edition.* Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— The Acts of the Apostles. *4th edition.* 7s. 6d.

— St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. *3rd edition.* Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— The Epistles to the Corinthians. *3rd edition.* Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— The Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians. *3rd edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s.

— The Epistles to the Colossians, Thessalonians, and Timothy. *3rd edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s.

— The Epistles to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews. *3rd edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s.

— The Epistles of SS. James, Peter, John, and Jude. *2nd edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s.

— The Revelation of St. John the Divine. *2nd edition.* Crown 8vo. 6s.

SADLER (M. F.) Sermon Outlines for the Clergy and Lay Preachers arranged to accord with the Church's Year. *2nd edition.* Crown 8vo. 5s.

-
- Church Doctrine—Bible Truth. *51st thousand.* Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
 - The Church Teacher's Manual of Christian Instruction. Being the Church Catechism expanded and explained in Question and Answer, for the use of Clergymen, Parents, and Teachers. *46th thousand.* Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
 - Confirmation. An Extract from The Church Teacher's Manual. *70th thousand.* 1d.
 - The One Offering. A Treatise on the Sacrificial Nature of the Eucharist. Fcap. *11th thousand.* 2s. 6d.
 - The Second Adam and the New Birth ; or, the Doctrine of Baptism as contained in Holy Scripture. *12th edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
 - Justification of Life: its Nature, Antecedents, and Results. *2nd edition, revised.* Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.
 - The Sacrament of Responsibility ; or, Testimony of the Scripture to the Teaching of the Church on Holy Baptism, with especial reference to the Cases of Infants ; and Answers to Objections. *9th thousand.* 6d. With an Introduction and an Appendix. On fine paper, bound in cloth. *8th edition.* 2s. 6d.
 - Sermons. Plain Speaking on Deep Truths. *9th edition.* 6s. Abundant Life, and other Sermons. *2nd edit.* 6s.
 - Scripture Truths. A Series of Ten Tracts on Holy Baptism, The Holy Communion, Ordination, &c. 9d. per set. Sold separately.
 - The Communicant's Manual ; being a Book of Self-examination, Prayer, Praise, and Thanksgiving. Royal 32mo. *119th thousand.* Cloth, 1s. 6d. ; roan, gilt edges, 2s. 6d. ; padded calf, 5s. A Cheap Edition in limp cloth. 8d.
 - — — A Larger Edition on fine paper, red rubrics. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

SCRIVENER'S Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. Edited by the Rev. E. Miller, M.A., formerly Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. With Portrait and numerous Lithographed Facsimiles from Ancient Manuscripts. For the Use of Biblical Students. *4th edition.* 2 vols. Demy 8vo. 32s.

SCRIVENER (Dr.) *Novum Testamentum Græce*

Textus Stephanici, A.D. 1550. Accedunt variae lectiones editionum Bezae, Elzeviri, Lachmanni, Tischendorfii, Tregellesii, curante F. H. Scrivener, A.M., D.C.L., LL.D. 16mo. 4s. 6d.

EDITIO MAJOR. Small post 8vo. 2nd edition. 7s. 6d. An Edition with wide Margin for Notes. 4to. half bound, 12s.

This is an enlarged edition of Dr. Scrivener's well-known Greek Testament. It contains the readings approved by Messrs. Westcott and Hort, and also those adopted by the Revisers—the Eusebian Canons, and the Capitula (majora et minora) are included. An enlarged and revised series of References is also added, so that the volume affords a sufficient apparatus for the critical study of the text.

SOCRATES' and SOZOMEN'S Ecclesiastical Histories.

Translated from the Greek. 2 vols. 5s. each. (*Bohn's Theological Library.*)

STEERE (E.) Notes of Sermons, arranged in Accordance with the Church's Year. Edited by Rev. R. M. Heanley, M.A., Oxon. With Introduction by the Bishop of Lincoln. Crown 8vo. 3rd Series. 7s. 6d.

— A Memoir of Edward Steere, D.D., LL.D., Third Missionary Bishop in Central Africa. By R. M. Heanley, M.A., Oxon, Vicar of Upton Grey. With Portrait, Four Illustrations, and Map. 2nd edition, revised. , Crown 8vo. 5s.

STREANE. (A. W.) Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue. Texts and Translations by Dr. Gustaf Dalman. Together with an Introductory Essay by Heinrich Laible. Translated and Edited by the Rev. A. W. Streane, D.D., Fellow, and Divinity and Hebrew Lecturer, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. 8vo. 5s.

— The Double Text of Jeremiah (Massoretic and Alexandrian) Compared, together with an Appendix on the Old Latin Evidence. By the Rev. A. W. Streane, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THACKERAY (F. St. John). Sermons Preached in Eton College Chapel. By the Rev. F. St. John Thackeray, M.A., Vicar of Mapledurham. Small crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THEODORET and EVAGRIUS. Histories of the Church. Translated from the Greek. 5s. (*Bohn's Theological Library.*)

YOUNG (Rev. P.) Daily Readings for a Year on the Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By the Rev. Peter Young, M.A. 6th edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 1s.





BR

Asplen, Leonard Oberlin.

746
A8

A thousand years of English church history from earliest times to the death of Queen Elizabeth, by Asplen ... London, G. Bell and sons, 1898.

xiii, 11, 372 p. 18 $\frac{1}{2}$ ".

1. Great Britain--Church history. I. "

333309

CCSC/ej

